This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

1837
ARTES
VERITAS
SCIENTIA
LIBRARY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
E PLURIBUS UNUM
SI QUAERIS PENINSULAM AMOENAM
CIRCUMSPICE

THE

CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

A

Quarterly Review.

VOL. XXVII.

JANUARY — JUNE.

LONDON:
PUBLISHED BY J. & C. MOZLEY,
6, PATERNOSTER ROW;
AND D. APPLETON & CO. 200, BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

1854.

LONDON:
H. CLAY, PRINTER, BREAD STREET HILL.

THE

CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

JANUARY, 1854.

ART. I.—1. *Census of Great Britain*, 1851. *Population Tables.*

2. *Results of the Census of Great Britain in* 1851. *By* EDWARD CHESHIRE. London: J. W. Parker.

THE opening of the present century was characterised by a panic fear amongst the political economists. A series of bad seasons, raising corn to six guineas a quarter, with now and then a further advance—till, in 1801, wheat reached 180*s.*, and the quartern loaf was for a month as high as 1*s.* 10½*d.*—were, it must be owned, no unreasonable causes for depression, and very naturally turned the current of public thought into gloomy channels. In the time of adversity there is no remembrance of prosperity; want and famine grew to be considered necessary conditions of our being; not so much evils to be delivered from, as to adapt ourselves to. Men began to have hungry eyes, to grudge new sharers in such short commons; and the cry arose that the world was becoming too populous. New terms were invented, suited to the magnitude of the evil: and the 'superfecundity' of our race,—our English race especially—was enlarged upon with morbid anxiety, and a dismal pleasure in proving the imminence of the danger. It was pronounced that, at our present rate of increase, there would soon not be standing room. England's geographical area was measured out, and the arithmetician discovered that its twelve millions of millions of square inches would, in five hundred years, at an unlimited rate of increase, have twelve millions of millions of families to provide for. And while the human race thus increased in a 'geometric ratio,' it was discovered—from reasons best known to these calculators—that the produce of the earth could only increase in an arithmetical ratio. We need not say that the produce, marshalled forth as 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, made a poor figure in the race against the rapid advance of the consumers, represented by 1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32, 64, 128, 256, 512. With such ocular demonstrations, it needed but a limited acquaintance with numbers to fore-

155190

see hideous famine, and every horror humanity can be subject to, as the necessary concomitants of such a disproportion between supply and demand. Indeed, these calamities could hardly be otherwise than welcome to imaginations haunted by an intolerable apprehension of want of breathing space. War, pestilence, and famine, were positive reliefs in the inevitable predicament; they were accepted as a natural law—the drains by which the wealthy, thinking, and otherwise respectable classes, were to maintain their ground. As for the labouring classes, the vast bulk of mankind, there was no rational hope of their deliverance from a perpetual pressure against the limits of subsistence,—famine always near, want a condition of their being, with only such temporary remission from this horrible struggle as a raging epidemic, or a desolating war, or an absolute famine could bring,—but temporary resources, all of them, to check the hordes the prolific future would pour in to fill the vacancy. The destroying angel must always stand on this awful 'limit,' his sword drawn in his hand, sweeping away the helpless crowds which the blind impulses of human nature would for ever thrust up against it. Such were the apprehensions a few years' scarcity, and the flagrant evils of our then Poor-Law system, could raise in the minds of intelligent, if we cannot call them sensible men. That we have not misrepresented these fears, a few extracts will show. Our first is from Senior's 'Lectures on Population.'

'We have seen that, as a general rule, additional labour, employed in the cultivation of land *within a given district*, produces a less proportionate return. And we have seen that such is the power of reproduction and duration of life in mankind, that the population of a given district is capable of doubling itself, at least every twenty-five years. It is clear, therefore, that the rate at which the production of food is capable of being increased, and that at which population, if unchecked, would increase, are totally different. Every addition made to the quantity of food produced, makes in general a further addition more difficult. Every addition to the existing population diffuses wider the means of still further addition. If neither evil, nor the fear of evil, checked the population of England, it would amount in a century to above two hundred millions. . . . . It is clear, however, that long before the first century had elapsed, no excellence in our institutions, or salubrity of climate, or unremitting industry, could have saved us from being arrested in our progress by a constantly increasing want of subsistence. If all other moral and physical checks could be got rid of,—if we had neither wars nor libertinism,—if our habitations, and employments, and habits were all wholesome, and no fears of indigence or loss of station prevented or retarded our marriages, famine would soon exercise her prerogative of controlling, in the last resort, the multiplication of mankind.'—*Senior's Lectures*, pp. 12, 13.

Malthus, vigorous and plain-spoken, and led on by his theory into a total disregard of the feelings, or, as he would hold them, weaknesses, of all whose ideas of humanity he outraged, thus complacently dwells on his favourable aspect of exterminating diseases:—

'The widening of these drains (palsy, apoplexy, gout, &c. &c.) was necessary to carry off the population, which still remained redundant, notwithstanding the increased operation of the preventive check and the part which was annually disposed of, and enabled to subsist by the increase of agriculture.

'Dr. Haygarth, in the sketch of his benevolent plan for the extermination of the casual small-pox, draws a frightful picture of the mortality which has been occasioned by this distemper, attributes to this the slow progress of population, and makes some curious calculations on the favourable effects which would be produced in this respect by its extermination. His conclusions, however, I fear, would not follow his premises. I am far from doubting, that millions and millions of human beings have been destroyed by small-pox. But were its devastations, as Dr. Haygarth supposes, many thousand degrees greater than the plague, I should still doubt whether the average population of the earth had been diminished by them. The small-pox is certainly one of the channels—and a very broad one—which nature has opened for the last thousand years, to keep down the population to the level of the means of subsistence; but had this been closed, others would have become wider, or new ones would have been formed. In ancient times, the mortality from war and the plague was incomparably greater than in modern. On the gradual diminution of the stream of mortality, the generation and almost universal prevalence of the small-pox is a great and striking instance of one of those changes in the channels of mortality which ought to awaken our attention, and animate us to patient and persevering investigation. For my own part, I feel not the slightest doubt, that if the introduction of the cow-pox should extirpate the small-pox, and yet the number of marriages continue the same, we shall find a very perceptible difference in the increased mortality of some other diseases. Nothing could prevent this but a sudden start in our agriculture; and should this take place, which I fear we have not much reason to expect, it will not be owing to the number of children saved from death by the cow-pox inoculation, but to the alarms occasioned among the people of property by the late scarcities, and to the increased gains of farmers, which have been so absurdly reprobated. I am strongly, however, inclined to believe, that the number of marriages will not in this case remain the same; but that the gradual light which may be expected to be thrown on this interesting topic of human inquiry will teach us how to make the extinction of a mortal disorder a real blessing to us, a real improvement in the general health and happiness of society.'—*Malthus's Principles of Population*, vol. ii. p. 290, *4th edition.*

In this passage the philosopher allows himself to hope that men will grow wiser, and not marry at the rate they have done; but that this was no permanent state of feeling with him, but rather the contrary persuasion, that this fatal tendency of human beings must produce inevitably the evils we have already touched upon, is shown in a passage in his correspondence with our first-quoted economist, Mr. Senior.

'As a voluntary retardation of their own increase, in the mass of the people, cannot be effected without restraint and self-denial, to which there is certainly a much less tendency than to marriage, the practical result is such as might be expected; namely, that although this restraint and self-denial may prevent more misery and vice at one period than at another; though they are often more efficient in civilized and populous countries, than in ignorant and thinly peopled countries; and though we may hope that they will become still more efficient as knowledge advances; yet, as

far as we can judge from history, there never has been a period of any considerable length, when premature mortality and vice, specifically arising from the pressure of population against food, has not prevailed to a considerable extent; nor, admitting the possibility, or even the probability, of those evils being diminished, is there any rational prospect of a near approach to their entire removal.'—*Correspondence with Mr. Senior*, p. 86.

The pressure of certain acknowledged evils, rising at one period to a crisis, may probably, we have said, have induced this train of thought in cold and speculative intellects; but when once entertained, it is very certain that the subject and the view altogether grew to be a very favourite one with these theorists, who, inured to the occupation of making the whole train of human calamity fit neatly into a system, and adopting an abstract and technical phraseology, as if purposely to exclude human feeling in the discussion of the highest human interests, lost all sense, in their studies, of the reality of the evils, the vice and misery, they so glibly discussed, and betrayed, one and all, a very decided unwillingness to admit the possibility of a brighter side to the question. With some minds, the discovery of a *cause* for certain evils is much the same final act, and produces the same sense of satisfaction, as the finding a remedy does to more practical heads and hearts. Malthus and his followers were not, indeed, without a remedy, but it was one, they were well aware, not suited to human nature, nor ever likely to be acted upon. Such as it was, however, they were as jealous of its exclusive power, as though they believed it the true panacea for every evil of life. 'We must on no account do anything which tends directly to encourage marriage,' said they. 'The poor must be taught that the greatest part of their sufferings 'proceeds from imprudence in this respect;' that 'their only mode 'of bettering their condition is by withholding the supplies of 'labour, which they, being possessors of this commodity, have 'alone the power to do;' 'that this is the principal and most 'permanent cause of poverty;' going on to prove that even industry itself would not avail anything if all men were industrious; that no man has a right to marry, with only the means of maintaining two children, when the average shows he may have three or four; that such a man falling into want, however steady and otherwise praiseworthy his conduct may have been, is no fit object for national help, but a criminal in his country's eyes. As no abstract can do justice to the firmness of Malthus's views on this point, we will give his own words. After proposing the total abolition of the Poor-Laws, and suggesting that the clergyman of each parish should always, after publishing the banns, read a short address on the duty of every man to support his own children, he goes on:—

'After the public notice (the above clerical exhortation) which I have proposed, had been given, and the system of Poor-Laws had ceased with

pleads the love of country, of parents, kindred, friends, and companions, as real reasons why he should not attempt to improve his condition elsewhere. But even should the subject of so much regard think otherwise, the resource is both temporary and inadequate.

'Every resource, however, from emigration, if used effectually, as this would be, must be of short duration. There is scarcely a state in Europe, except, perhaps, Russia, the inhabitants of which do not often endeavour to better their condition by removing to other countries. As these states, therefore, have nearly all rather a redundant than deficient population, in proportion to their progress, they cannot be supposed to afford any effectual resources to emigration to each other. Let us suppose for a moment that, in this more enlightened part of the globe, the internal economy of each state was so admirably regulated, that no checks existed to population, and that the different governments provided every facility for emigration. Taking the population of Europe, excluding Russia, at a hundred millions, and allowing a greater increase of produce than is probable, and even possible, in the mother countries, the redundancy of parent-stock in a single century would be eleven hundred millions, which, added to the natural increase of the colonies during the same time, would more than double what has been supposed to be the present population of the whole earth. Can we imagine that in the uncultivated parts of Asia, Africa, or America, the greatest exertions and the best directed endeavours could, in so short a period, prepare a quantity of land sufficient for the support of such a population? If any sanguine person should feel a doubt upon the subject, let him add twenty-five or fifty years more, and every doubt must be erased in overwhelming conviction.

'It is evident, therefore, that the reason why the resource of emigration has so long continued to be held out as a remedy to redundant population is because, from the natural unwillingness of people to desert their native country, and the difficulty of clearing and cultivating fresh soil, it never is or can be adequately adopted. If this remedy were indeed really effectual, and had power so far to relieve the disorders of vice and misery in old states as to place them in the condition of the most prosperous new colonies, we should soon see the phial exhausted, and when the disorders returned with increased virulence, every hope from this quarter would be for ever closed.

'It is clear, therefore, that with any view of making room for an unrestricted increase of population, emigration is perfectly inadequate; but as a partial and temporary expedient, and with a view to the more general cultivation of the earth, and the wider spread of civilization, it seems to be both useful and proper.'—*Malthus*, vol. ii. p. 71.

Such were the arguments used by one philosopher, and held unanswerable by many others, fifty years ago. Why, (even by their own showing,) because the world would be full of people some hundreds or thousands of years hence, persons suited to one another, and loving one another, should not marry meanwhile, is not explained: nor why we are bound to consider the future so much in a matter in which the future might be very well left to take care of itself.

Looking back upon the warmth and zeal with which these opinions were entertained, we see the force of local circumstances to influence minds which think themselves most speculative and capable of abstraction. These reasoners may be

said to have discarded faith for sense and reason, and arguing, as all in this temper must, from a limited field of inquiry and with limited powers, the present and the near entirely obscured the full bearings of the subject from their minds.

There are few things which a clever man may not undertake to prove with such a show of reason and logic, that common sense and instinct will find it hard to maintain their ground in the controversy. The only thing for a plain man to do in such cases is to consider how the theory first arose in the arguer's mind. If we see in him a strong leaning to it because it is his *own* conception, or because it falls in with his principles, or because it suits his interests, or because his argument requires it, we may very well disregard a great deal of reasoning we have not wit or practice to refute. If all the people who could not answer Malthus had remained single in obedience to his dictum, the English nation might still have been restricted to this island's shores, struggling for a bare subsistence from its sole produce, the victims of 'preventive checks,' with only half our numbers, and those inadequately supplied. But nature and observation found opposing arguments more influential in conduct, though offering a poor resistance on paper. We remember the reply with which a working-woman summarily discarded the Malthusian dissuasion from matrimony, as entailing the expense and burden of a family, when such arguments were rife in the world,—'Them as is'nt' (she argued) 'done but do, 'and them as is done;' which, less tersely rendered, means—'those who are single only just get a living, and those that are married always get that.' Reasoning potent then and always, and, it must be owned, answering very much to our experience, though none can feel more strongly than we do the evil and consequent miseries of rash and thoughtless marriages.

It is in no spirit of boasting, nor as expressing any confidence in the permanence of a prosperity even now threatened in more than one quarter, that we have chosen to preface our notice of the recent Census by the contrast these gloomy theories offer to the actual facts which have from time to time been brought to light, and never more strikingly than in these lately issued papers: and to show how formal statements and interminable arrays of figures may vindicate the goodness of Providence and the permanence of its laws against all the forebodings and threatenings of faithless alarmists. We know not what the future may have in store for us, nor what reverses the years to come may hide from us. But we see that the command to increase and multiply and replenish the earth has been obeyed, in spite of the fears of political economists; that nature and reason have safely despised their paper difficulties; that there have been thousands and myriads of happy homes where they

would have prescribed cheerless solitude, and innumerable families have been maintained where they prophesied want and misery; that millions of heirs to a glorious immortality have been born where their theories required an empty void; that rich wastes have been peopled where they foresaw only failure and distress; that the world's resources have opened out indefinitely where they expected only a limited and short-lived supply;—in a word, that liberty and just laws, and industry and skill, and the genius of a powerful race, and our excellent institutions, and our salubrious climate, have produced the consequences apprehended by these reasoners, of an increase in population unknown before in the history of the world, but that hitherto the earth's resources have kept pace, and more than kept pace with the increase,—and so far their ill prophecies have signally failed; that never has there been a people at once so increasing and so prosperous. The maxims of Divine Providence still hold good,—still 'in all labour there is profit,'—'the thought of the diligent still tends to plenty;' still the earth is for *all;* the valleys still laugh with corn; God's thousand hills have still their countless flocks, and men gladly go forth, leaving their own people and their fathers' house, to cultivate and to tend them. Still we may greet the bridegroom with the Christian marriage song, and all its train of blessings,—'Oh, well is thee, and happy shalt thou be,' for the earth has still room enough and to spare for wife and children, and countless virtuous homes.

In fifty years the population of Great Britain has doubled itself, and, if we take into the account those vast numbers who have left its shores, has trebled itself within that period, and yet these multitudes—not shutting our eyes to the present so-called scarcity—are more prosperous, better supplied with the necessaries of life, with food and clothing, than when all these fears of 'superfecundity' were first entertained, and England contained ten millions instead of twenty millions of souls.

The subject of statistics has never been regarded with much general favour. Persons who delight in numbers, and who have a faculty for reducing all subjects to a matter of figures, viewing every question of morals and politics through their medium, are regarded very much as a distinct peculiar race, who must expect no sympathy from the world at large in the pleasures and difficulties, the discoveries and perplexities of their art. It must be owned that all forms and combinations of numbers fall dead on the common ear; that there are multitudes who never take them into their minds at all—who derive no ideas from hundreds and thousands and millions—who, being told certain great numerical facts one day, are found the next totally oblivious, and who cannot remember with

any approach to accuracy any fact wherein numbers are concerned, whether it be the date of an historical event, the remoteness of celestial bodies, the distances on the earth's surface, the numbers of its inhabitants,—who recoil, in self-defence, from any questioning on such subjects—who could not trust themselves to hazard an answer, lest they should prove preposterously and ludicrously mistaken—who, having been told perhaps a hundred times the population of London, may yet be a million wrong in their estimate, if so rash as to make one. All this every one's experience, either of himself or others, must show to be true enough; and hitherto the statisticians have gone on announcing their numbers, and their hearers forgetting them, as though each had acknowledged the fitness of such a division of labour. But there is in the present day a strong desire to popularize science. There is an increasing yearning for sympathy in all intellectual exertions; fields of thought hitherto held barren of general interest are being daily reclaimed, and forced upon public attention; and statisticians themselves are emulous, though little hopeful of a more favourable acceptance of their numerical discoveries. There is something almost pathetic in the appeal for public interest with which the papers before us inaugurate the thousands upon thousands of pages of figures which they present to an apathetic world as the results of the census. Feeling that these pages do hide wonderful facts, important truths, great moral lessons, they would fain engage the world's attention to them; recalling the enormous amount of thought and organized labour which have been expended in their compilation, they long that men should realize and value their useful toils. But experience teaches them how little of this kind of reward may be looked for. It is thus, in the language of his craft, believing figures the most trustworthy vehicle for knowledge, and instinctively measuring all by this scale, that Mr. Cheshire expresses the modesty of his hopes, in the preface to his pamphlet, detailing some of the principal features of the census papers.

'The labour of condensing so voluminous and elaborate a publication into a *hundredth* part of its original bulk has been considerable; but the Author will be adequately rewarded if *one in a thousand* of the British population, herein enumerated, care to possess, in a concise form, some of the most interesting details concerning their *own* country which ever emanated from a Government Department.

'The popular impression that a census consists of an accumulation of numbers only, is most erroneous. A census comprises information of deep and varied interest, but unfortunately the magnitude of the undertaking necessitates a publication of corresponding proportions; hence the more interesting details, and many very important results, lie buried in such a mass of statistics, that it is extremely doubtful whether one person in a

million ever takes the trouble to become acquainted with the contents of a census.'—*Cheshire*, Preface.

And again he thus pleads for the intelligence, as well as industry, which must have been brought into exercise to produce so remarkable a result.

'Public opinion allots to the Registrar-General very prosaic duties. Persons in general consider it a very simple matter to record the births, marriages, and deaths, as they occur; to draw up an annual report concerning them; and once in every ten years to count the people. It is true, in the latter case, they understand that to number the heads of the British population involves a certain amount of trouble, but they imagine that the task could be easily accomplished by a subdivision of labour, and that when a series of operations in simple addition had been performed, the result was completed. Those, however, whose investigations lead them to consult the elaborate and voluminous reports which issue from the General Register and Census Offices, form a widely-different opinion of the ability displayed, and of the laborious operations carried forward, in those important departments of the State.'—*Ibid.* Introd. p. 9.

And this is very true. In reading the Report, and also in turning over for ourselves the folios of various thickness which constitute the result of these labours, we are astonished at the variety and accuracy of the information gathered together. When the *whole* results are given, for which a concluding publication is promised, it will seem as if all that could be said of our aggregate population may be found therein. Indeed it is almost alarming to each individual unit to find in how many relations he has been the subject of state inquiries, and how far his privacy has been invaded. Lodged, if not buried, within piles of figures, tracing himself from one table to another, each reader sees himself the object of vigilant scrutiny; his sex, his age, his present locality, his birthplace, his house, his occupation, the sources of his subsistence, the number and sex of his servants, his condition as married, single, or widower, parent, or childless, householder, or less responsible inmate; his freedom from or subjection to personal infirmities; his creed, his education, his civil and political rights, everything about him but his inmost heart and soul have been penetrated into, and made subject of calculation, the ground-work of theories and matter for legislation. Nor are these pages wanting in another likeness to the grave to which, for their secrecy and tenacity, we may well compare them. In them all are equal. The circumstances of all have been equal matter of interest and curiosity; the duke and the pauper occupy the same room on the paper; no doubt the Queen herself has helped to fill up a householder's schedule, and taken up no more space than the humblest of her subjects. We gladly avail ourselves of Mr. Cheshire's condensed history of the means used for taking the census, drawn from the official Report.

'The inquiries undertaken at the census of 1851 were of a far more extensive character than those pursued at any previous enumeration, for it was resolved to exhibit not only the statistics of parishes, and of parliamentary and municipal boroughs, but also of such other large towns in England and Scotland as appeared sufficiently important for separate mention, and of all the ecclesiastical districts and new ecclesiastical parishes which, during the last forty years, had been created in England and Wales. In addition, also, to the inquiry concerning the occupation, age, and birthplace of the population, it was determined to ascertain various relationships, such as husband, wife, son, daughter,—the civil condition, as married, unmarried, widower, or widow,—and the number of blind, or deaf and dumb. Moreover, the design was formed of collecting statistics as to the accommodation afforded by the various churches and other places of public worship throughout the country, and the number of persons generally frequenting them; also as to existing educational establishments, and the actual number of scholars under instruction. It was, however, subsequently considered doubtful whether the Census Act rendered it compulsory upon parties to afford information upon these points; this inquiry was, therefore, pursued as a purely voluntary investigation.

'The local machinery by which the objects thus contemplated were to be attained differed considerably in England and Scotland. In England and Wales the *Registration Districts*, which, for the most part, are conterminous with the *Unions*, were made available for enumerating the population. Of these districts there were 624, each having a superintendent registrar; and these were divided into 2,190 sub-districts, each having a local registrar of births and deaths. Under the supervision of their 624 superintendents, the 2,190 registrars were directed to form their sub-districts into *Enumeration Districts*, according to certain instructions. The number of such enumeration districts in England and Wales was 30,610, each district being the portion assigned to one enumerator, who was required to complete his enumeration in one day.'—*Cheshire*, p. 10.

We need not describe the schedules, which our readers will remember filling up with more or less alacrity; some jealous of what seemed unconstitutional prying into private affairs, others amused with this new form of self-portraiture, and responding with minuteness to the nation's curiosity; but they may be interested to know that the total weight of these schedules was forty tons, and their number 7,000,000. The time, the 31st of March, was chosen as being in the season when there is the least displacement of the population.

'In the winter season of the year people are in the greatest numbers at home; while in summer, in the hay, the corn, and the hop harvest, many of the labouring, and all the vagrant classes of the nation, wander about and sleep in fields, in barns, and in sheds, or under trees and tents. The Irish have for many years crossed the sea in large numbers before harvest, and afterwards returned home. Business, fairs, festivals, the sessions, assizes, fashion, watering-places, railways, and great works of every kind, displace the people; and it is impossible to take the census at any period of the year when some of these disturbing causes are not in operation; but it was considered, on the whole, that no better day in 1851 could be fixed on, to avoid their interference, than the last day of March; which was also the month in which the first census of Great Britain was taken.'—*Census Report*, p. xxiv.

No one present on that night was to be omitted, and no person absent was to be included, except policemen and others on night duty, miners and potters, and whoever else habitually worked in the night; travellers were enumerated at the hotels at which they might stop on the following morning. Bargemen, tramps, and gipsies were numbered in their boats, tents, and encampments, to the great annoyance of some of them; one tribe of gipsies taking a great deal of fruitless trouble to escape the general scrutiny. Houses, as well as inhabitants, were reckoned up, and an exact account taken of all that were uninhabited or building.

When the enumerators had transcribed the householders' schedules into the enumeration book with which each was supplied, and completed the various summaries and estimates, for which one week was allowed, they forwarded them, together with the voluntary returns relating to schools, churches, &c., to the respective registrars; and here the enumerators' labours ended. The census returns were now in the hands of 3,220 registrars, or dividers of districts. The business of these registrars was to give a careful and systematic examination and revision of the documents laid before them, and then to prepare a summary to be transmitted with the enumeration books themselves to the superintendent registrar for a further revision. A fortnight was allowed for this work, at the end of which the functions of the registrars ceased. The summaries and enumeration books were now in the hands of 624 superintendent-registrars, who, after further investigation, transmitted them to the Census Office, not exempt even then from a final scrutiny before the commencement of the abstract, which reduces the nearly 40,000 enumeration books into three thick portentous folios, the marrow of which Mr. Cheshire has endeavoured to condense into a shilling pamphlet. The efforts by which the Report endeavours to make us comprehend the numbers and vast aggregates with which it has to deal, and which it would fain press on the imagination of its readers, are in exact accordance with the whole tenour of the volumes. Counting has given us this prodigious amount of details; counting must make us realize them. Multitude and space have hitherto defied, or else suffered from, exact measurement; the poet hopes to excite us by the indefinite and the vague. Not so the statistician, who clings to his art, and has faith in no other. It is thus Mr. Cheshire makes us see the army of enumerators.

'*An idea may be formed of the extent of this army of enumerators, and of the labour of engaging their services on the same day, when it is mentioned that it would take* seven hours and three quarters for the whole *body, in single file,* to pass a given point, at *quick* march; and it would

take upwards of thirteen hours and a half to count them at the rate of one a second. The army recently encamped at Chobham (9,000), converted for the nonce into enumerators, would not have sufficed to enumerate a *fourth* of the population of Great Britain.'—*Cheshire*, p. 11.

And thus the Report, not without success, first announces the number of the people, and then would have us pause, and count them up for ourselves, and finally range them in their sexes and professions, to pass in review before the mind's eye.

'The number of people in Great Britain, including the islands in the British Seas, on March 31st, 1851, was 20,959,477; and the men in the Army, Navy, Merchant Service, and East India Company's Service, abroad, on the passage out, or round the coasts, belonging to Great Britain, amounted on the same day to 162,490. The population of Great Britain may therefore be set down at *Twenty-one millions, one hundred and twenty-one thousand, nine hundred and sixty-seven* (21,121,967).

'The number of people in England and Wales was 17,927,609, namely, 16,921,888 in England, and 1,005,721 in Wales; the number of people in Scotland was 2,888,742: 143,126 inhabited the Isle of Man, Jersey, Guernsey, Alderney, and other small islands in the British Seas; and 162,490 were at sea, or serving abroad in the army.

'It is difficult to form any just conception of these large numbers, for men are rarely seen in large masses, and when seen their numbers are seldom known. It is only by collecting, as in other cases of measuring, the units into masses, these masses into other masses, and thus ascending progressively to an unit comprehending all others, that the mind attains any adequate notion of such a multitude as a million of men. Thus from a file of *ten persons*, which the eye takes in at one view, the mind readily conceives ten such groups or a *hundred*, and again ascending to ten hundred or a *thousand;* to ten thousand or a *myriad;* to ten myriads or *a hundred thousand;* and to ten hundred thousand or *a million*—arrives at a conception of the *Twenty-one millions* of people which Great Britain contained within its shores on the night of March 30th, 1851. Another way of arriving at this conception is by considering the numbers in relation to space; as 4,840 persons might stand without crowding on the 4,840 square yards in an acre; 3,097,600 persons would cover a square mile (equal 640 acres); and the twenty-one millions of people in Great Britain, allowing a square yard to each person, would therefore cover seven square miles.

'The building of the Great Exhibition in London enclosed eighteen acres, and 50,000 or 60,000 persons often entered it daily; on the 9th of October, 93,224 persons filled its floor and galleries, and could almost be surveyed by the eye at one time. Of 100,000 persons a general notion can be formed by all those who witnessed this spectacle at the Crystal Palace; it is a number greater than were ever, at one time, in a building covering eighteen acres, but somewhat less than the greatest number (109,915) that ever entered it on one day, October 7th. The population then of Great Britain, including men, women, and children, exceeds 211 *hundred thousands;* and at the rate of a hundred thousand a day, could have passed through the building in 211 days; the English, as they are 169 hundred thousand—in 169 days; the Welsh, 10 hundred thousand, in ten days; the Scotch, 29 hundred thousand, in twenty-nine days; the 143,126 Islanders in the British Seas, in less than one and a-half day; the 162,490 soldiers and seamen absent from the country when the census was taken, in less than two days. The population of Great Britain in 1801 amounted in round numbers to 109 *hundred thousands;* and 102 of the 211 *hundred thousands* in 1851, or as many as could pass through such a

place in 102 days, would represent the increase of the people of Great Britain in half a century.

'In the course of the analysis of this mass of people, it has been already stated that they will be subdivided into males and females: and it will be seen that at home there are 102 hundred thousand men and boys, 107 hundred thousand women and girls; and that the females exceed the males in the great and imaginary procession by five hundred thousand. They will then be arranged in the order of age; the few aged persons of 90, followed byt nose of 85, 80, 75, 70, in quinquennial sections down to 20, 15, 10, 5, and children in their mothers' arms. Again, they will be classed in sections as bachelors, spinsters, husbands, wives, widowers, widows. And, first classed according to place of residence, they will be subsequently grouped under the counties and countries in which they were born. Their final arrangement will be in Professions, or groups engaged in similar occupations; princes, peers, commoners, officers of Government, and municipal authorities; soldiers, seamen, clergymen, lawyers, physicians and surgeons; authors, artists, scientific men, teachers; merchants bankers, brokers, and shopkeepers; carriers by railways, roads, canals, rivers, seas; landlords, farmers, agricultural labourers, woodmen, gardeners, fishermen, grooms and huntsmen; the numerous classes engaged in art and mechanical productions—makers of arms, machines, carriages, ships, houses: the thousands working and dealing in Animal matters—furs, hair, wool, silk; in matters derived from the Vegetable Kingdom—vegetable food, drinks, stimulants; wood, hemp, flax, cotton, paper: the workers and dealers in Minerals—the colliers, quarriers, potters, glass-workers, jewellers, smiths in gold, silver, copper, tin and zinc—plumbers, braziers, iron-miners, and an endless throng of workers in iron and steel. There will also be the thousands of labourers without any definite occupation; scholars, and children at home of undetermined occupation. And finally, will follow paupers, prisoners, lunatics, and vagrants, who form a fraction of the population. It will then be evident from this survey—which will extend over the thousands in more than a thousand different professions, subdivided into innumerable bands—that as the greatest Exhibition of modern times only displayed a small part of the produce of their labours, so the visitors only represented a fraction of the multitudinous population of these islands, which the Census Enumerators found so variously occupied on the sea, on rivers, on the coasts, in the valleys, on the hills; in cities, towns, villages, and solitary houses over all the face of the cultivated land.'—*Census Report*, pp. xxv.—xxvii.

Does not every reader, we would ask, having his fancy tasked to conceive a multitude, feel a sense of disappointment, on hearing that the whole British population could stand in a space of seven square miles? that gazing from the brow of a hill in clear weather, this little mirror of the human eye could hold and reflect them all, at a glance, within its narrow bound. Our imagination has been taught to picture greater crowds than these, and passes on to that multitude, *whom no man can number*, composed of all nations, and to that more terrible and still vaster assemblage—that great census of the human family, and that one numbering-day, when all the tribes of the earth shall be reckoned once for all, when angels shall be the enumerators, and none shall escape the scrutiny. But it is admitted, that '*to mass quantity* is to conceal bulk,' which Mr. Cheshire

illustrates by the fact, that the whole vast yields of California and Australia, melted down into a solid mass of gold, would only fill a tolerable-sized room. So he proposes a method of imaging forth our population more likely to impress our fancy.

'Now, if all the people of Great Britain had to pass through London in procession, four abreast, and every facility was afforded for their free and uninterrupted passage, during twelve hours daily, Sundays excepted, it would take nearly three *months* for the whole population of Great Britain to file through, at *quick* march, *four* deep. To count them singly, at the rate of one a second, would take a year and a half, assuming that the same number of hours daily were occupied, and that Sundays also were excepted.' —*Cheshire*, p. 17.

This exception of *Sundays* in the visionary reckoning, seems to give it a reality almost alarming, as if the task was already set us, with its long working-days of labour, and brief Sabbaths of repose. But passing from these efforts to bring the general mind to embrace the magnitude and vast importance of the subject of population, it will be well to proceed at once to the various topics which the Report treats of, and which turns the mere barren counting of numbers into a most valuable source of information on all the principal points connected with the present state and future prospects of our nation. We need not dwell upon 'the objects of the census and the machinery employed,' and the 'number of the people' has already been given, together with the outline of the proposed plan for the second, and as yet unpublished part of the census. The first great division of this vast aggregate brings out the uniform excess of females over males in the living population, along with the excess of male *births* over female. The probable reasons for this difference are reserved for future discussion; the facts are these:—

'The number of the male population of Great Britain was 10,386,048—of the female population 10,735,919: the females exceeded the males by 349,871; and the males at home were 10,223,558; consequently the females exceeded by 512,361 the males *in* Great Britain. To every 100,000 females the males were 96,741; including 1,538 males abroad, the exclusion of whom leaves 95,203 males at home. The excess of females over males was nearly the same, proportionally, in 1801 and 1851: thus, in 1801, to every 100,000 males there were 103,353 females; in 1851 the females were 103,369 to the same number of males. The proportion in both periods was nearly 30 males to 31 females. The excess of females over males at each Census is thus shown:—

Years.	Excess of Females over Males.
1801	180,027
1811	201,598
1821	210,537
1831	297,246
1841	348,950
1851	349,871

'To 100,000 males at home, in 1851, the females were 105,012; or there were twenty males at home to twenty-one females.

heads from her day to ours; and thus to count up the old maids of a single coterie might be considered an unworthy matter for investigation; but when these valuable females may be reckoned by myriads, the precise amount is the just subject for minute analysis and urgent—even impatient—inquiry. We have already been shown them as vestals heading the vast imaginary procession of 20,000,000. The Report computes that the surplus ladies of Great Britain would fill the Crystal Palace five times over. Pursuing this idea, Mr. Cheshire anxiously looks forward to the publication of the second part of the Census, when it shall be known definitely 'how many of these were spinsters.' For us, we accept the fact as a confirmation of our long-established conviction, that the world could not do without a class it has so flippantly undervalued, and that a body of single women of mature age is indispensable to the well-being of society.

It will have been seen, that the annual rate of increase in the population has varied in each decennial period; the greatest rate of increase having been between the years 1811 and 1821, when there was little emigration, and the mortality in England was lower than it has ever been before or since, down to the two last decennaries (1841—1851), when the public health has suffered from epidemics and influenza, cholera, and other diseases; while emigration from the *United Kingdom* has proceeded at an accelerated rate, from 274,000 in 1821-31, to 718,000 in 1831-41, and 1,693,000 in 1841-51.—*Report*, p. xxx.

The Report leaves this part of the subject with an interesting inquiry, containing a moral for us all, into the number of survivors from previous censuses, going on to show us our own chances of living through future similar computations.

'Before quitting this subject, it may be interesting, and will in some cases be useful, to give an approximative estimate of the numbers surviving in 1851 out of the population enumerated at the previous censuses. By the English Life Table it is shown that the half of a generation of men of all ages passes away in *thirty years*, and that more than three in every four of their number die in half a century. The English population, owing to its rapid increase, contains an excessive number of children and young people, and will live longer than a generation normally constituted. The subjoined numbers are on this account probably less than the survivors of the living in previous censuses; but taking emigration and all other movements of the population into account, it is not likely that of the 21,121,967 in Great Britain in 1851, more than 2,542,289 were in the country in 1801; or much more than half the number (10,729,607) in 1831; seven persons in eight of the living have entered the kingdom within fifty years, *one* in *two* within twenty years.' . . .

'At the present rates of mortality, a few of the present generation (21,121,967) will live a century, and survive the year 1951; and, if the population were normally constituted in respect to age, about 4,918,568 would live fifty years (to A.D. 1901), and 10,433,762 would live thirty years. The probable number of survivors can be given more exactly when the ages of the living are abstracted.'—*Census Report*, p. xxx.

The rate at which the population of Great Britain increased from 1801 to 1851, is such, that if it continue to prevail uniformly, the population will double itself every fifty-two years.

We now pass on to what is called the 'Law of Population,' by which term we may understand the various elements which affect the increase of population.

"The numbers, and consequently the increase or decrease, of people in a civilized country, depend upon the age of marriage and the age of the parents when their children are born—the numbers who marry, the fertility of the marriages—the duration of life—the activity of the migration flowing into or out of the country. These acts more or less influence each other, and in the present state of statistical observation, the precise effect of a change in any one of them involving others cannot be determined. It will be sufficient to indicate the effect of a change in each element, while the others remain constant.'—*Ibid.* p. xxxi.

If the duration of life, or mean lifetime, increases, then the population necessarily increases with it. 'Thus, if the mean lifetime of a population is thirty years, then if the births are 100,000 a-year, and remain uniform, the population will be thirty times 100,000, or 3,000,000. But if, the births remaining the same, the lifetime be gradually extended to forty years, then the population will become 4,000,000; or if the lifetime extend to fifty years, then the population, from the extension of life alone, will rise from three to five millions.' The deaths upon this hypothesis will be equal to the births, and the same in number when the population is *five*, as when it is *four* or *three* millions. It is probable that the mean lifetime has increased under certain favourable circumstances.

The next element of the 'law' we have spoken of, is the age of parents when children are born; and early marriages must necessarily vastly increase population, by shortening the interval between generations, so long as the evils incident to imprudent marriages do not occur to cut off the new comers.

'In ordinary times, a large proportion of the marriageable women of every country are unmarried, and the most direct action on the population is produced by their entering the married state. Thus in the South Eastern Division, comprising Surrey, Kent, Sussex, Hants, and Berks, the number of women of the age of 20 and under the age of 45, amounted, at the last census, to 290,209; of whom 169,806 were wives, and 120,403 were spinsters or widows. 49,997 births were registered in the same counties during the year 1850, or 10 children were born in 1850 to every 58 women living in 1801. Of the children, 46,705 were born in wedlock, 3,292 were born out of wedlock; consequently, 36 wives bore in the year *ten* children, and of 366 unmarried women of the same age (20-45) *ten* also gave birth to children (*see* Table VIII. p. xxxii.) A change in the matrimonial condition of a large proportion of the 120,403 unmarried women, out of 290,209 women at the child-bearing age, would have an immediate effect on the numbers of the population; and, if continued, by increasing the

rate of birth to the living through successive generations, would operate on population like a rise in the rate of interest on the increase of capital.'—*Ibid.* p. xxxi.

The effects of migration upon population are evident enough. The immigration of Irish, a stream now flowing mainly in another direction, has greatly contributed to swell our numbers. Our own emigration to foreign shores has immensely increased their population, of which the United States form a leading example. Since 1821, 2,685,747 persons emigrated from us, who, if simply added to our population, make the survivors and descendants of the races within the British isles in 1821, now 30,410,595.

'Finally, the numbers of the population are increased by an abundance of the necessaries of life; and reduced by famines, epidemics, and public calamities, affecting the food, industry, and life of the nation. The pestilences of the middle ages—the famine, the influenza, and the cholera of modern times—are examples of one class of these agencies; the security and freedom which England has latterly enjoyed, are examples of the beneficent effect of another class of influences, not only on the happiness of the people, but also on the numbers which the country can sustain at home, and can send abroad to cultivate, possess, and inherit other lands.

'All these causes, affecting the increase of the population of Great Britain, and the precise extent to which each operates, will ultimately be known by means of a continuous series of such observations as have been commenced at this census.'—*Ibid.* p. xxxii.

From considering the nation as individuals, the Report next proceeds to regard it as 'aggregations of individuals in communities;' in other words, 'families.' And here it becomes necessary to define what the term 'family' really means,—a most comfortable word for loose common use, but perplexing to the constructors of acts of parliament,—and it is explained to be the *social unit* of which parishes, towns, counties, and the nation are composed. In its essential sense, a 'family,' though most complete as composed of husband, as householder, wife, children, servants, visitors, &c., may shrink into a single woman occupying a small cottage. Mr. Rickman, a great authority in these matters, dwells on the difficulty of determining the relation of lodgers under the roof of householders, and says that the enumerators of past censuses were instructed 'that those who use the same kitchen and board together are to be treated as one family.' But the niceties of this question even the Report itself cannot absolutely decide upon; and the Census of 1851 preferred to use the word occupier or occupiers, which stands for the term families in the previous censuses. In 1801, the number of families in Great Britain was 2,260,802; in 1851 it was 4,312,388. It is so much in the order of nature that a family should live in a separate house, that house and family are synonymous in some languages, though nowhere

might it seem so much so as in England, where the distribution of families in separate houses is most universal.[1] The Report quotes a passage from Dr. Carus, a German writer on England, in commendation of this custom.

'"I cannot take leave of the subject without a remark on English dwelling-houses, which stand in close connexion with that long-cherished principle of separation and retirement, lying at the very foundation of the national character. It appears to me to be this principle which has given to the people that fixity of national character, and strict adherence to the historical usages of their country, by which they are so much distinguished; and up to the present moment, the Englishman still perseveres in striving after a certain individuality and personal independence, a certain separation of himself from others, which constitutes the foundation of his freedom. This, too, was completely an ancient German tendency, which led our remote ancestors to prefer the rudest and most inconvenient, but isolated homesteads, to the more convenient and refined method of life in aggregation; it is this that gives the Englishman that proud feeling of personal independence, which is stereotyped in the phrase, '*Every man's house is his castle.*' This is a feeling which cannot be entertained, and an expression which cannot be used in Germany or France, where ten or fifteen families often live together in the same large house.

'"The expression, however, receives a true value, when, by the mere closing of the house-door, the family is able, to a certain extent, to cut itself off from all communication with the outward world, even in the midst of great cities. In English towns or villages, therefore, one always meets either with small detached houses, merely suited to one family, or apparently large buildings extending to the length of half a street, sometimes adorned like palaces on the exterior, but separated by partition walls internally, and thus divided into a great number of small high houses, for the most part three windows broad, within which, and on the various stories, the rooms are divided according to the wants or convenience of the family; in short, therefore, it may be properly said, that the English divide their edifices perpendicularly into houses—whilst we Germans divide them horizontally into floors. In England, every man is master of his hall, stairs, and chambers—whilst we are obliged to use the two first in common with others, and are scarcely able to secure ourselves the privacy of our own chamber, if we are not fortunate enough to be able to obtain a secure and convenient house for ourselves alone."'—*Ibid.* pp. xxxv. xxxvi.

[1] In London, at the present time, there is a bold attempt to innovate in this particular. Let any of our readers, who have not yet seen the change in that once uninviting locality, make his way to Victoria Street, Westminster, and admire the vast and imposing range of buildings, in various stages of progress and completion, which occupy one side of the wide thoroughfare. These are designed to supply what 'The Builder' calls a long-felt desideratum—complete residences in flats, after the Parisian plan. Each house consists of six shops, on each side of and entirely distinct from a handsome door-way, and wide stone staircase, which leads to eight suites of apartments, occupying four stories, and each containing every requisite for a family dwelling. The highest of these family residences must be reached by more than a hundred steps—recalling the weary ascent so many of us have trod, after a day's travelling or sight-seeing, up to the *quatrième* of some huge foreign hotel. All of them, even the most attainable, seem incapable of the ideas of house and home, however useful for temporary habitation, and convenient in many of their arrangements. As a *system*, we could not see such buildings spread without regret; but in a vast city like London, expedients of all sorts may be allowable, or even necessary, to bring the overgrown population within convenient reach of their daily occupations.

On which the Report enlarges with proper national feeling on our superiority on this point to the nations of the Continent:—

'The possession of an entire house is, it is true, strongly desired by every Englishman; for it throws a sharp, well-defined circle round his family and hearth—the shrine of his sorrows, joys, and meditations. This feeling, as it is natural, is universal, but it is stronger in England than it is on the Continent; for although, there, the great bulk of the population in the country is in separate dwellings, while in many English towns several families are in the same house, the crowding, to which Dr. Carus refers, of the middle and higher classes, who sleep in flats, stratum over stratum, is carried to an inconceivably greater excess in the capitals, and the other cities of the Continent, than it is in England. The department of the Seine, for instance, in 1835-6, contained 50,467 houses, and 1,106,891 persons, or 22 persons to a house; so that there must be four or five families in Paris to a house; whilst London, in 1851, contained 2,362,236 persons, 533,580 occupiers, in 305,933 houses; and consequently nearly eight persons to one house; or, more exactly, 77 persons, forming 17 families, to 10 houses. It will be shown that, in a certain number of English towns, 15, 20, and 24 families are in 10 houses, on an average; but these cases are exceptional, and the general rule is, that each family in England has a house.

'The towns and cities of the two northern English counties and of Scotland, however, are built in the continental style; and the families of the middle classes, as well as of the poor, live in large flats, which constitute separate tenements within the same party-walls.'—*Ibid.* p. xxxvi.

The following calculations on the average number of persons to a family, persons to a house, and families to a house, as seen in Scotland, are curious:—

'Where a house is occupied by a family, the head of the family is a householder; but as this term is scarcely applicable to the holders of apartments, it has given place to *occupier* in some recent Acts of Parliament. That family and occupier have, however, been used in nearly the same sense, at the enumerations of the population, is evident, on comparing the number of families in 1801-31, and the occupiers of 1851, with the population. Thus it is seen, in Great Britain, that the average number of persons to a family in the Censuses 1801-31, was 4.6; 4.7; 4.8; and 4.8: while the number of persons to an occupier in 1851 was 4.8. There is a slight irregularity in 1831, but as a general rule, the proportion of persons to a family has gradually increased since 1801, as is apparent in the annexed Table (XIII). The average numbers in a family in *England and Wales* were, 4.7; 4.7; 4.8; 4.8; in 1801-31, and 4.8 in 1851.

'The average number of persons to a house in Great Britain, at each census, from 1801 to 1831, was 5.6; 5.7; 5.8; 5.7; and in 1851, the proportion was the same (5.7) as in 1831. The number of persons to a house in *England and Wales* was less in 1841 and 1851, than in the previous censuses. In Scotland, the number of persons to a family has steadily increased, from 4.4 in 1801, to 4.8 in 1851; the difference in 1851 between the numbers to a family, in England and Scotland, is inconsiderable. The average number of persons to a house has also increased in Scotland, from 5.5 to 7.8; and while the number of persons to a house in Scotland in 1801 was less than in England, it was in 1851—perhaps from an increase in the number of large houses—considerably more.—*See* Tables XIII. and XIV.'—*Ibid.* p. xxxvi.

In England and Wales the number of families to a house has declined in the last fifty years from 120 families to 113 families in 100 houses; a fact which a very little thought must enable us to realize as a great improvement in the habits and condition of the people. A great deal of space is given in the Report to the variations in different districts of the rule of a family and a house. It is an important subject, as all must feel who are acquainted with the *necessity*, we may almost say, of a separate dwelling in ordinary cases for every labouring family,—and are aware of the dirt, discomfort, quarrels, dissensions, and even worse evils, which follow upon crowded lodging and too close contact. We will give Mr. Cheshire's condensation of the facts elicited by the census on this head:—

'The number of families to a house varied considerably in different counties, and it is difficult to account for all the anomalies which they present. In Essex, Suffolk, and Norfolk, few houses contained more than one family. Plymouth and the adjacent districts had more than two families, together averaging ten persons, to a house. In Worcestershire, Warwickshire, Gloucestershire, Herefordshire, Shropshire, and Staffordshire, a large proportion of the people lived in separate houses, with the exception of Bristol, Clifton, Gloucester, Hereford, and Birmingham. In the counties of Leicester, Rutland, Lincoln, Nottingham, Derby, and Yorkshire, nearly all the families lived in separate houses, the city of York and Hull being scarcely exceptional cases to the rule. In Lancashire and Cheshire, more than 300,000 out of 472,907 families lived in separate houses. Liverpool, Bolton, Manchester, and Salford, were the chief places where two or more families in many cases occupied the same house. In the northern division of England, comprising Cumberland, Northumberland, Durham, and Westmoreland, the proportional number of families and persons to a house increased.

'In Wales, the system of isolated dwellings generally prevailed, with some few exceptions.'—*Cheshire*, p. 23.

In spite of our little faith in the aptitude of the greater proportion of mankind to retain facts dependent upon numbers, it is necessary in this question to subject our readers to a considerable amount of this kind of detail. Out of these arrays of figures many curious and interesting facts may be deduced, but it is indispensable to learn the facts in the way the statisticians choose to give us them.

Thus from the following maze, as it may seem, of figures can be elicited an epitome of the changes and chances of our mortal life: we see in it the proportions in which the gifts of nature and fortune are dispensed, and how great are the external inequalities of our condition. We have glimpses of every shade of prosperity and privation, of labour and leisure, of solitude and society, of gratified affections and broken hopes, from the solitary hearth or the lonely barn, to the parental home crowded with children, friends and dependants. What innumerable changes and reverses,—what extremes of social position,—what hopes

and fears, joys and sorrows, lie buried underneath the facts which form the groundwork of this classification!

'In order to throw some light, by classification, on the constituent parts of families, the returns of the 14 subdistricts, before referred to, in different parts of the kingdom, have been analyzed; and the results are annexed in a tabular form (*see* Table XVII. p. xlii.). 41,916 heads of families were husbands-and-wives; 10,854 widowers *or* widows; 14,399 bachelors *or* spinsters; in 440 and a few more cases the head of the family was absent from home. 36,719 (more than half) of the heads of families had children living with them—they were parents; 7,375 (nearly 1-10th) had servants—they were masters and mistresses; 4,070 (1-17th) had with them visitors—they were hosts; 8,543 had relatives with them; 1,020 (1-67th) had apprentices or assistants in their respective trades—they were masters. Of the 67,609 families, only 3,503 (5.2 per cent.) consisted of husband, wife, children, servants; whilst 4,874 consisted of man, wife, and servants, which Aristotle characterizes as the constituents of a family. The heads in 24,180 instances had neither children, relatives, visitors, servants, nor trade assistants; like some corporations they may be characterized as "sole." Thus of 41,916 married couples, 8,610 were "sole:" 29,969 had children residing with them, either alone or in other combinations; namely, 21,413 had children alone—that is, without servants, trade assistants, visitors, or relatives; 3,132 had children, and other relatives (alone); 2,269 had children and servants; 1,421 had children and visitors; 149 had children and trade assistants; 550 had children, relatives, and servants; 245 had children, relatives, and visitors; 360 had children, visitors, and servants; 33 had children, relatives, and trade assistants; 65 had children, visitors, trade assistants; 166 had children, servants, trade assistants; 69 had children, relatives, visitors, servants; 50 had children, relatives, servants, trade assistants; 34 had children, visitors, servants, trade assistants; 5 had children, relatives, visitors, trade assistants. Only 8 families consisted of husband and wife, children, relatives, visitors, servants, trade assistants. Of 41,916 natural families (comprising husband and wife) nearly 21 per cent. (1 in 5) consisted of the husband and wife sole, 71 per cent. of the husband and wife, with their children in various combinations; 8 per cent. of the husband and wife, with servants and others. Of 10,854 families, at the head of each of which was a widower or widow, 3,264 were heads sole, 6,405 had children in various combinations, 1,185 servants, and other connexions; the proportions of the three classes were 30, 59, and 11 per cent. respectively. Of 14,399 designated families having a bachelor or a spinster at their head, 12,306 were sole (lodgers generally); 238 had children residing with them, born out of wedlock, and 1,855 had servants, relatives, or visitors with them.

* * * *

'The average number of members in a family depends to a considerable extent on the fact, whether (1) single lodgers are or are not taken as families; (2) on the number of children at home; and (3) on the number of servants. The number of children at home in families is seen (Table XVIII.) to vary considerably; the greatest number of children at home in one family was 12, in these subdistricts. Of the 41,916 families having man and wife at their head, 11,947 had no children at home; 8,570 had each *one* child at home; 7,376 had each *two* children at home; 5,611 had each *three* children at home; 14 had each 10 children; and 5 had each 11 children. The total number of children at home was 82,145; the number of their parents was 84,046; consequently the number of children to a family was on an average nearly 2 (or exactly 1.95.); and the average

number of *persons* to a natural family 4, (or 2 + 1.95 = 3.95). 30,076 families had *one or more* children at home; or 2.73 *children* on an average to each family; and adding the two parents, 4.73 *persons* to each family. The natural family of the widower or widow was smaller; it was on an average composed of the widower or widow, and 1.28 children; 2.28 persons. If those cases only are taken in which one child, at the least, resides with the parent, the family will on an average amount to 3.17 persons. The total number of widowers and widows in the 14 subdistricts was 14,374; so that 3,520 are included in the combinations, such as relative, and are reckoned as subordinate constituents of other families; 10,854 being themselves occupiers of houses and heads of families.'

* * * *

'Finally, there is the population sleeping in barns, in tents, and in the open air; comprising, with some honest, some unfortunate people out of employment or temporarily employed, gipsies, beggars, strollers, vagabonds, vagrants, outcasts, criminals. The enumeration of the houseless population, unsettled in families, is necessarily imperfect; and the actual number must exceed the 18,249 returned, namely, 9,972 in barns, and 8,277 in the open air.'—*Ibid.* pp. xli.—xliv.

A table of the public institutions in Great Britain will conclude this portion of the subject. It again furnishes in a short compass abundant matter for thought and reflection. The excess of female over male lunatics,—the excess of male over female prisoners, proving crime to be four times as prevalent among men as among women,—the remarkable equality of sexes in workhouses,—are all points of great interest, though rather beside the immediate question.

'TABLE V.—*Public Institutions in Great Britain in* 1851.

Class of Institution.	Number.	Persons Inhabiting them.		
		Males.	Females.	Total.
Barracks	174	44,833	9,100	53,933
Workhouses	746	65,786	65,796	131,582
Prisons	257	24,593	6,366	30,959
Lunatic Asylums	149	9,753	11,251	21,004
Hospitals for the Sick . .	118	5,893	5,754	11,647
Asylums and other Charitable Institutions . . .	573	27,183	19,548	46,731
Total	2,017	178,041	117,815	295,856

'Of the 295,856 persons in the aggregate occupying these 2,017 institutions, 260,340 were inmates, and 35,516 officers and servants; consequently, there were about seven inmates to one officer or servant.'—*Cheshire*, p. 24.

The constitution of families having been indicated, the Report proceeds to show the distribution of families in houses all over the country. The location of families is irregular, subject to modes of occupation, manner of life, the nature of

the soil, the configuration of the country, and the course of the rivers. But amidst these causes for difference two general laws are seen in universal operation, one leading to the equable diffusion of the population, the other to its condensation round centres. Thus we have the village, with its little group of houses, its green, its church, and its school, the centre of detached farms and cottages. These villages are arranged round other centres,—market-towns, where the men can assemble weekly, and return home in a day. By the same law, these centres at greater distances range round other centres, where the heads of the chief families can readily congregate at stated times: and, finally, the large towns stand in the same relation to the capital, which naturally finds its place in the centre of the kingdom, and is sufficient in itself, except when state or commercial emergencies bring it into communication with foreign cities. The present census brings out the remarkable fact, that the *town* and *country* population of Great Britain are equal—an unprecedented rate of distribution, which the commercial prosperity of the last fifty years has gradually tended to produce.

'Great Britain has *eight hundred and fifteen* towns of various magnitudes, either market towns, county towns, or cities; *five hundred and eighty* in England and Wales, *two hundred and twenty-five* in Scotland, and *ten* in the Channel Islands. To 21 of the preceding "villages" there is on an average a town, which stands in the midst of 110 square miles of country, equivalent to a square of $10\frac{1}{2}$ miles to the side, a circle having a radius of nearly 6 miles; so that the population of the country around is, on an average, about 4 miles from the centre.

'The population amounted to 10,556,288 in the 815 towns; which stand on 3,164 miles of area. An average town of 12,953 inhabitants, stands on an area of nearly 4 square miles; equivalent to a square of 2 miles to the side, a circle of $1\frac{1}{10}$th mile radius, and the population is less than three quarters of a mile from the centre.

'The population in the rest of Great Britain was 10,403,189; consequently if, for the sake of distinction, the detached houses, the villages, and small towns without markets, are called—country; at the present time the *town* and *country* populations of Great Britain differ so little in numbers, that they may be considered equal; for by the abstracts 10,556,288 people live in the towns, and 10,403,189 in the country. In the towns there were 5.2 *persons to an acre*, in the country 5.3 *acres to a person*. The density in the country was 120 persons—in the towns 3,337 persons—to a square mile.

'The average population to each town in Scotland was 6,654, to each town in England and Wales, 15,501; the Scottish is therefore much smaller than the English town. The average ground area of the English town is $4\frac{6}{10}$th miles, which form the centre of an area of 101 square miles. The exact numbers are given in Tables XXIII. and XXIV.; but a simpler notion of the average distribution of the population of England is obtained by conceiving the area of 58,320 square miles divided into 583 squares, each containing 25 square figures of 4 square miles; a market town in the central square containing 15,501 inhabitants, and the 24 similar squares arranged symmetrically around it in villages containing churches and

chapels, and houses holding in the aggregate 16,000 inhabitants. Now, imagine the figures to be of every variety of form as well as size, and a clear idea is obtained of the way that the ground of the island has been taken up, and is occupied by the population.

'The English towns are at the distance on an average of 10 $\frac{8}{10}$th miles from the centre of one to the centre of the other; the Scotch towns are 12 $\frac{7}{10}$th miles apart, and each Scotch town contains on an average less than half the population of the English towns.

'The 815 towns are grouped around 87 county-towns—52 in England, 32 in Scotland, and 3 chief towns, equivalent to county-towns, in the Islands of the British Seas. Each of the central county-towns was surrounded on an average by eight or nine other towns, extending over an average area of 1,067 square miles, equivalent to a square of 33 miles to the side; a circle of 18 miles radius: and without allowing for the extreme distance of the Islands in the British Seas, they were 35 miles apart. The population of the county-towns of Great Britain and the chief towns of the Channel Islands amounted to about 626,547 in 1801, and to 1,391,538 in 1851; in England and Wales the population of the county-towns was about 473,239 in 1801, and 1,076,670 in 1851.'—*Census Report*, pp. xlvi. xlvii.

A certain number of these towns have acquired an adventitious but extraordinary importance and magnitude through causes to which others are not subject. They have been created and are sustained by special circumstances, either as watering places, or for other purposes of resort, as sea-ports, or seats of mining or manufacturing enterprise. The towns have increased most rapidly in which straw plait, cotton, pottery, and iron are manufactured.

This tendency to group into masses, so evidently attractive to the statistician, is thus commented on by Mr. Cheshire, who makes one of his characteristic demands on our fancy, if by any means we may realize numbers:—

'Great Britain contained in 1851 *seventy* towns of 20,000 inhabitants and upwards, amounting in the aggregate to 34 per cent. of the total population of the country; whereas, in 1801, the population of such towns amounted to 23 per cent. only of the enumerated population, thus showing, in a marked degree, the increasing tendency of the people to concentrate themselves in masses. London extends over an area of 78,029 acres, or 122 square miles, and the number of its inhabitants, rapidly increasing, was two millions three hundred and sixty-two thousands two hundred and thirty-six (2,362,236) on the day of the last census. A conception of this vast mass of people may be formed by the fact that, if the metropolis was surrounded by a wall, having a north gate, a south gate, an east gate, and a west gate, and each of the four gates was of a sufficient width to allow a column of persons to pass out freely *four* abreast, and a peremptory necessity required the immediate evacuation of the city, it could not be accomplished under *four-and-twenty* hours, by the expiration of which time the head of *each* of the four columns would have advanced a no less distance than *seventy-five miles* from their respective gates, all the people being in *close* file, *four* deep.'—*Cheshire*, p. 26.

Pursuing the question of the density and proximity of the population, the Report endeavours to assist our powers of cor

ception by a series of diagrams,—circles of equal circumference, divided into hexagons of various sizes. Each six-sided figure represents the average amount of ground to a person, whereby the eye can see the close proximity we stand in to one another in the present day, compared to the vast amount of standing room in 1570, a space gradually diminishing from that date to this. From this we learn that in 1801 the people of England were on an average 153 yards asunder; in 1851, only 108 yards asunder. The mean distance between their houses in 1801 was 362 yards; in 1851, only 252 yards. In London the average proximity in 1801 was 21 yards; in 1851, only 14 yards. The extremes of density and separateness in the 624 districts of England and Wales are 185,751 persons to a square mile, and 18 to a square mile.

The conveniences of proximity, its effects on the intercourse of society, on the circulation of intelligence, and the general interests of civilization, need not be dwelt upon. Nor, with such safety-valves as America and Australia, need we give way to the nervous apprehensions of over-crowding which affected the politicians of fifty years ago, when each person had twice our present standing-room.

From these ideas of elbowing and crowding, it is curious to pass on to the notice of the numerous scattered islands which form part of the kingdom, and of their scanty populations. Five hundred islands have been numbered, but of these the census need take note of only one hundred and seventy-five, the rest being uninhabited. Without abandoning its formal details the Report assumes a poetical tone in treating of these romantic additions to our territories. It bestows attention on their solitudes, recapitulates their picturesque names, turns back to their history, dwells on their ecclesiastical greatness. Remote Iona, with its ruins and crosses, has honour done to it as the retreat of ancient piety and learning. A table of islands, ranged in order of populousness, varying from the peopled Channel Islands to the '1' of Inchcolm, transports us far away from towns and manufactures. Here the population least progresses, and many of these isles must be examples to Malthus' heart's content of a population dutifully submitting to his 'limits,' and kept by various 'checks' within his imaginary boundary of supply. Take S. Kilda, with its precarious harvests, its stationary population, and its infant deaths.

'S. Kilda is in the parish of Harris; and, away 70 miles from the mainland of the western Hebrides, it rises 1,500 feet above the waves. Rocks and inaccessible precipices surround it, except at one point on the north side, where there is a rocky bay; and another on the south-east side, where there is a landing-place which leads up to the village of S. Kilda, a quarter of a mile from the sea, on the sloping base of a steep hill. This is the

only inhabited place in S. Kilda and three other islands of the group, which are the resort of the seafowls, that, with fish and small patches of land, furnish employment and food for the inhabitants. The population has not before been stated, and has probably never before 1851 been officially enumerated. It was found to consist of 32 families, in 32 houses, and of 110 persons; of whom 48 were males, 62 were females. The 33 Gillies, 23 McDonalds, 20 McQuiens, 13 Fergusons, 9 McCrimons, 9 McKinnons, 2 Morrisons, and 1 McCleod, were all born on the island, except one woman, aged 35, a McDonald's wife, who was imported from Sutherland. The number of men between the ages of 20 and 60 is 25, and the number of women of the same age is one more, or 26; of the children under 20 there are 22 males, 30 females; one old man is above the age of 70, 6 women are more than 60 years of age, one has attained the age of 79.

'There are 19 married couples on the island; 2 widowers, 8 widows, 5 unmarried men, 5 unmarried women of the age of 20 and under 46. The men are all called "Farmers and Birdcatchers" in the Schedule: each "Farmer" occupying about 3 acres of land. Eight females are described as "Weaveress" in "wool." The mildness of the air covers the island with verdure; but the crops of bere and oats are often destroyed by terrific storms. The proprietor sends a yearly supply of meal to the island; without which the minister of Harris states that they would often be in want, notwithstanding the little crop, the sea-fowl eggs, and all the resources of the place. He refers to a tradition "that the population of the island has been stationary for 200 years;" sometimes falling below and sometimes exceeding 100 souls. "The great majority of the infants die of what they call the 'eight days' illness.' Several children were born in the last 12 months, but only 2 are living; and there have been 2 deaths during the last year." This differs from other information: for it is stated in the "Gazetteer of Scotland" that the number of adults in the island was at one time reduced to 4 by small-pox; and cholera in the first epidemic was fatal in this remote region. The dwellings of the poor people, who breathe the purest air of the sea and sky out of doors—in S. Kilda and in all the Western Isles—are left, through their ignorance, dirtier than the dens of wild animals. There is a manse and a church; but no medical man—no clergyman —resident in the island.'—*Census Report*, pp. liv. lv.

Contrast this mortality with that of our largest and least healthy towns, and it is made clear how little the salubrity of a situation can do if men's habits indoors, and in the immediate neighbourhood of their dwellings, are impure. Because the inhabitants are more dirty than those of Manchester, though the one lies in smoke,—every white garment streaked with it, every face grimed,—and the other has the purest sky and air, yet the mortality of the healthful island is beyond all comparison the greatest. Indeed, these documents throughout prove how mistaken is the general notion of the ultra salubrity of country over town, and show how much depends on men themselves; and that in our climate all atmospheres are wholesome where due attention to cleanliness is observed, and none escape contagion where local impurities are suffered to exist and accumulate. It is important, now that half our population live in towns, that this should be made clear. Many of the prejudices

against towns, on the score of health, should now be obsolete ones. In many a manufacturing town the children, the object of so much sentimental compassion, are rosier, plumper, more vigorous, than in the ill-drained adjacent villages. That it was not always so we know, but it is fitting that the zeal and patriotism of commerce on this question should be acknowledged by public opinion, and the results of strenuous, though still inadequate exertions, owned. Compare the descriptions of Manchester towards the end of last century and its present state —though that is open enough to improvement—and we shall see how much has been done since that time for the health, comfort, and moral welfare of the population. 'The inventions and im-'provements,' says Dr. Aikin, writing about 1795, 'of machines 'to shorten labour, have had surprising influence to extend our 'trade, and also to call in hands from all parts, especially chil-'dren, for the cotton-mills. It is the wise plan of Providence 'that in this life there shall be no good without its attendant 'inconvenience. There are many which are too obvious in 'these cotton-mills and similar factories, which counteract that 'increase of population usually consequent on the improved 'facility of labour. In these, children of very tender age are 'employed, many of them collected from the workhouses in 'London and Westminster, and transported in crowds as appren-'tices to masters resident many hundred miles distant, where 'they serve unknown, unprotected and forgotten by those to 'whose care nature or the laws had consigned them. These 'children are usually too long confined to work in close rooms, 'often during the whole night. The air they breathe, from the 'oil, &c., employed in the machinery, and other circumstances, 'is injurious; little attention is paid to their cleanliness, and 'frequent changes from a warm and dense to a cold and thin 'atmosphere, are predisposing causes to sickness and debility, 'and particularly to the epidemic fever which is so generally 'to be met with in these factories. It is also much to be ques-'tioned, if society does not receive detriment from the manner 'in which children are thus employed during their early years. 'They are not generally strong to labour, or capable of pur-'suing any other branch of business when the term of their 'apprenticeship expires. The females are wholly uninstructed 'in sewing, knitting, and other domestic affairs, requisite to 'make them notable and frugal wives and mothers. This is a 'very great misfortune to them and the public, as is sadly 'proved by a comparison with the families of labourers in hus-'bandry and those of manufacturers in general. In the former 'we meet with neatness, cleanliness, and comfort; in the latter, 'with filth, rags, and poverty, although their wages may be

'nearly double to those of the husbandman. It must be added, 'that the want of early religious instruction and example, and 'the numerous and indiscriminate association in these buildings, 'are very unfavourable to their future conduct in life.' Much of this evil, it cannot be denied, continues still, but it is so far modified and corrected, that neither in health nor yet in morals do our manufacturing towns present the unfavourable contrast they once did to our rural population. Witness, on the sanitary part of the question, the evidence of Mr. Porter on this very subject:—

'It has been supposed that the general healthiness and duration of life among the people must be diminished by their being brought together in masses, and in particular it has been objected to the factory system of this country, that by this means it has added to the sum of human misery. To combat this opinion, it will be sufficient at present to bring forward the case of Manchester, where the increase of population has been great beyond all precedent, owing to the growth of its manufacturing industry.

'The population of the townships of Manchester and Salford, at each of the decennary enumerations, was found to be as follows:—

1821 ...	94,876	
1811 ...	115,874,	increase 22 per cent.
1821 ...	161,635	„ 39½ „
1831 ...	237,832	„ 47 „
1841 ...	353,390	„ 48½ „

The increase during the whole period of forty years being 258,514, or 272 per cent. upon the population of 1801. Much of this increase has arisen from continual immigration to a town of such growing manufacturing prosperity. The degree in which the natural condition of the population has been thereby affected, will be seen from the following figures, which exhibit the proportions living at different ages in Manchester and Salford, compared with the proportions in all England at the Census in 1841:—

	Manchester and Salford.	England.
Under 5 years	1,328	1,323
5 and under 10 years ...	1,070	1,195
10 „ 15 „	1,007	1,087
15 „ 20 „	1,004	996
20 „ 30 „	2,059	1,787
30 „ 40 „	1,549	1,295
40 „ 50 „	996	963
50 „ 60 „	545	642
60 „ 70 „	306	436
70 „ 80 „	113	213
80 „ 90 „	21	58
90 and upwards	2	5
	10,000	10,000

The mortality of these townships in the middle of the last century, as stated from the parish registers, was 1 in 25; in 1770, 1 in 28. In 1811, when the population had already very greatly increased, the rate of mortality had sunk considerably, and in the ten years ending with 1830 was not more than 1 in 49; a low rate, if we take into the account the fact

increase has been. To understand the causes of these differences a very slight knowledge of the principal objects of our manufactures and commerce is sufficient.

POPULATION *of each* COUNTY *in* ENGLAND *and* WALES, *as enumerated at each Census from* 1801 *to* 1851, *inclusive; also Increase of Population per cent. in the half century.*

COUNTIES.	Years.						Increase of Population per cent. in 50 Years.
	1801.	1811.	1821.	1831.	1841.	1851.	
ENGLAND.							
Bedford	63,393	70,213	84,052	95,483	107,936	124,478	96
Berks	116,480	119,430	132,639	146,234	161,759	170,065	54
Buckingham	108,132	118,065	135,133	146,977	156,439	163,723	51
Cambridge	89,346	101,109	122,387	143,955	164,459	185,405	107
Chester	192,305	227,031	270,098	334,391	395,660	455,725	137
Cornwall	192,281	220,525	261,045	301,306	342,159	355,558	84
Cumberland	117,230	133,665	156,124	169,262	178,038	195,492	66
Derby	161,567	185,487	213,651	237,170	272,202	296,084	83
Devon	340,308	382,778	438,417	493,908	532,959	567,098	66
Dorset	114,452	124,718	144,930	159,385	175,054	184,207	61
Durham	149,384	165,293	193,511	239,256	307,963	390,997	160
Essex	227,682	252,473	289,424	317,507	344,979	369,318	62
Gloucester	250,723	285,955	336,190	387,398	431,495	458,805	82
Hereford	88,436	93,526	102,669	110,617	113,272	115,489	31
Hertford	97,393	111,225	129,731	142,844	156,660	167,298	72
Huntingdon	37,568	42,208	48,946	53,192	58,549	64,183	71
Kent	308,667	371,701	427,224	479,558	549,353	615,766	98
Lancaster	673,486	828,499	1,052,948	1,336,854	1,667,054	2,031,236	201
Leicester	130,082	150,559	174,571	197,003	215,867	230,308	77
Lincoln	208,625	237,634	283,058	317,465	362,602	407,222	95
Middlesex	818,129	953,774	1,145,057	1,358,330	1,576,636	1,886,576	130
Monmouth	45,568	62,105	75,801	98,126	134,368	157,418	244
Norfolk	273,479	291,947	344,368	390,054	412,664	442,714	62
Northampton	131,525	141,353	163,097	179,336	199,228	212,380	61
Northumberland	168,078	183,269	212,589	236,959	266,020	303,568	79
Nottingham	140,350	162,964	186,873	225,327	249,910	270,427	93
Oxford	111,977	120,376	138,224	153,526	163,127	170,439	52
Rutland	16,300	16,380	18,487	19,385	21,302	22,983	41
Salop	169,248	184,973	198,311	213,518	225,820	229,341	36
Somerset	273,577	302,836	355,789	403,795	435,599	443,916	62
Southampton	219,290	246,514	282,897	313,976	354,682	405,370	83
Stafford	242,693	294,540	345,972	409,480	509,472	608,716	151
Suffolk	214,404	253,963	271,541	296,317	315,073	337,215	57
Surrey	268,233	323,851	399,417	486,434	584,036	683,082	154
Sussex	159,471	190,343	233,328	272,644	300,075	336,844	111
Warwick	206,798	228,906	274,482	336,645	401,703	475,013	130
Westmoreland	40,805	45,922	51,359	55,041	56,454	58,287	43
Wilts	183,820	191,853	219,574	237,244	256,280	254,221	38
Worcester	146,441	168,982	194,074	222,655	248,460	276,926	89
York (East Riding)	111,192	133,975	154,643	168,891	194,936	220,983	97
York (City)	16,846	19,099	21,711	26,260	28,842	36,303	116
York (North Riding)	158,927	170,127	188,178	192,206	204,701	215,214	35
York (West Riding)	572,168	662,875	809,363	984,609	1,163,580	1,325,495	132
WALES.							
Anglesey	33,806	37,045	45,063	48,325	50,891	57,327	68
Brecon	32,325	37,735	43,826	47,763	55,603	61,474	90
Cardigan	42,956	50,260	57,784	64,780	68,766	70,796	65
Carmarthen	67,317	77,217	90,239	100,740	106,326	110,632	64
Carnarvon	41,521	49,655	58,699	66,818	81,093	87,870	111
Denbigh	60,299	64,249	76,428	82,665	88,478	92,583	54
Flint	39,469	45,937	53,893	60,244	66,919	68,156	72
Glamorgan	70,879	85,067	102,073	126,612	171,188	231,849	223
Merioneth	29,506	30,854	34,382	35,315	39,332	38,843	32
Montgomery	48,184	52,184	60,245	66,844	69,607	67,335	40
Pembroke	56,280	60,615	73,788	81,425	88,044	94,140	66
Radnor	19,135	20,417	22,533	24,743	25,458	24,716	29

Another test of the different rate of increase in towns without one leading branch of manufactures, and others which possess one, is to borrow from the tables the relative populations of some of our chief commercial towns at the opening of this century to the present time, and contrast them with others taken at random from the same, or neighbouring districts.

	1801.	1851.
Bradford (Parish)[1]	29,794	149,543
Halifax	63,434	149,257
Leeds	53,162	172,270
Huddersfield	14,848	46,130
Sheffield (Parish)	45,755	135,310
Hull	22,161	50,670
Liverpool	77,653	258,236
Wigan	25,552	63,287
Bolton-le-Moors	29,826	87,280
Bury	22,300	70,143
Manchester (Parish)	112,300	452,158
Ditto (Township)	70,409	186,986
Prestwich	31,065	94,470
Middleton	7,991	16,796
Rochdale	39,757	98,013
Preston	14,300	72,136
Macclesfield	8,743	29,648
Stockport	27,698	91,423

After contemplating these doublings and quadruplings, take the soberer progress, sometimes no progress at all, of a list of market towns in the North Riding of Yorkshire.

	1801.	1851.
Over Silton	241	285
Leake	1,105	1,273
Kirby Sigston	285	282
North Otterington	492	667
Ainderby Steeple	587	845
Danby Wiske	427	554
Great Langton	168	271
Bedale	2,259	2,892
Burneston	1,302	1,635
Kirklington	409	553
Well	1,047	1,044
Thornton Watlass	407	421
Masham	2,430	2,695
East Witton	682	610
Coverham	1,006	1,221
Spennithorne	655	796
Hankswell	300	326

[1] Parish includes a wider range than the Parliamentary or Municipal limits. The parish estimate best shows the manufacturing increase; thus, the population of Bradford within the Parliamentary limits is 103,778, and of Halifax, 33,582.

These great folios consist, as we have said, of population papers, lists of names, and the figures belonging to them; but a running comment of notes down each page accounting for anomalies, or anything out of the usual course of increase in different places, throws considerable light on the real condition of each district; and the state of activity or depression of its inhabitants. Every decrease between the present and the last Census has to be accounted for in some way or other, and we can trace from the causes given, vastly greater energy in one race of the population than another. Perhaps in the people of Yorkshire this energy and vigilant care of their proper interests is most apparent: for instance, it is well known that agricultural wages are at least a third higher in Yorkshire than in Norfolk, Wiltshire, or Somersetshire; and that agricultural labourers in that county are, by comparison, in a most prosperous and well-fed condition; yet decrease of population is often attributed to agricultural 'depression' and migration to the towns. Emigration, too, is very frequent, and an air of bustle, movement, and change distinguishes every page. The mining districts, on the contrary, seem unfavourable to emigration, and the word does not occur in the notes on Durham, Cumberland, Northumberland, nor Westmoreland. Again, in Suffolk and Norfolk, where, especially in the latter county, the wages are at a universally low rate, there is little mention of emigration, except in the Hundreds bordering on the sea. This may be accounted for from want of energy in the people, and the known discouragement of emigration by the farmers, who apprehend a consequent rise in wages. In these counties, and again in Somersetshire and Wiltshire, we often read of cottages pulled down, or manufactures abandoned. Things are evidently not so flourishing as in the north; we can trace privation, depression, and want of spirit down many a column. But in these two last counties noted for their low wages, the idea of emigration has evidently taken root, and gained ground; their proximity to some great sea-ports being, of course, a stimulus.

Wherever early marriages have caused an increase of population, it is noted down as a peculiarity of that hamlet or village, while in some neighbouring parish we can trace a wiser system, for imprudent marriages seem often to be a mania confined to some narrow district, as if one instance had set the example to others.

Mr. Cheshire's concluding table gives the amount of emigration from Great Britain, from 1843 to 1852 inclusive, from which we gather that the number of emigrants sailing from the United Kingdom in 1852 was, on an average, upwards of a *thousand a day.*

Emigration from Great Britain and Ireland in each Year from 1843 *to* 1852, *inclusive, and the destination of the Emigrants.*

Years.	Destination of Emigrants.				
	British North America.	United States.	Australia and New Zealand.	All other Places.	Total.
1843.....	23,518	28,335	3,478	1,881	57,212
1844.....	22,924	43,660	2,229	1,873	70,686
1845.....	31,803	58,538	830	2,330	93,501
1846.....	43,439	82,239	2,347	1,826	129,851
1847.....	109,680	142,154	4,949	1,487	258,270
1848.....	31,065	188,233	23,904	4,887	248,089
1849.....	41,367	219,450	32,191	6,490	299,498
1850.....	32,961	223,078	16,037	8,773	280,849
1851.....	42,605	267,357	21,532	4,472	335,966
1852...—	32,876	244,261	87,881	3,749	368,764

In the Report's 'concluding remarks on the general results of the inquiry,' it touches upon the close relation that exists in England, as opposed to the Continent, between the town and country population. A slight acquaintance with foreign countries shows the truth of the remark quoted from Mr. Laing, that in them the town and city population are much more apart and separate from the country people than with us. There the little fortified towns, with their walls and gates, stand as sharp and distinct as they did five hundred years ago—'each city or town like a distinct island, or small nation, with its own ways of living, ideas, laws, and interests;' while the country population stands aloof, equally distinct in customs and costume, a people wholly separate from the towns, and comparatively little affected by their influences, either for good or evil. Upon our superiority in this respect the Report dwells as follows:—

"One of the moral effects of the increase of the people is an increase of their mental activity; as the aggregation in towns brings them oftener into combination and collision. The population of the towns is not so completely separated in England as it is in some other countries, from the population of the surrounding country: for the walls, gates, and castles which were destroyed in the civil wars, have never been rebuilt; and the population has outgrown the ancient limits; while stone lines of demarcation have never been drawn around the new centres of population. Tolls have been collected since a very early period in the market-places; but the system of *octroi*—involving the examination, by customs' officers, of every article entering within the precincts of the town—has never existed. The freemen in some of the towns enjoyed, anciently, exclusive privileges of trading; but the freedom could always be acquired by the payment of fines; and by the great measure of Municipal Reform (1835), every town has been thrown open to settlers from every quarter. At the same time, too, that the populations of the towns and of the country have become so equally balanced in number—*ten millions* against *ten millions*—the union between them has become, by the circumstance that has led to the increase of the towns, more intimate than it was before; for they are now connected together by innumerable relationships, as well as by the associations

of trade. It will be seen in the final publication, that a large proportion of the population in the market-towns, the county-towns, the manufacturing towns, and the metropolis, was born in the country; and that in England, town and country are bound together, not only by the intercourse of commerce and the interchange of intelligence, but by a thousand ties of blood and affection.

'The town and the country populations are now so intimately blended that the same administrative arrangements easily apply to the whole kingdom.'—*Census Report*, pp. lxxxiii. lxxxiv.

One most interesting topic remains to be elucidated by the forthcoming promised papers, which are to contain the voluntary returns respecting schools, churches, dissenting places of worship, and the amounts of their congregations, &c., together with the number of new churches, chapels, and meeting-houses built to supply the 'increasing demand' for religious instruction and general education. As far as numbers can tell anything on such matters, these will undertake to show the 'spiritual condition as well as educational institutions of the people of Great Britain; approximately, however, for, we understand, the Clergy found it both inconvenient and otherwise unseemly to venture on the numbers of attendants at Church.

We have now touched upon the various subjects of the present Census tables. Contradicting the forebodings of narrow-minded and faithless politicians, they show the country in an unexampled state of populousness and prosperity. Such words cannot be said without fear; but we must acknowledge blessings, and be thankful for them, though we own them to be immeasurably beyond the nation's deserts, and in their nature fluctuating and temporary. Though our national greatness decline from to-day, we must still witness to the gracious care of God's good Providence, who has blessed the industry of this great people hitherto, and failed in none of His promises. Nor, should the nation's prospects again darken for a season, must the evil time be used, as it once was, for an argument that legislation should have interfered to check the impetus of commerce which the present half-century has witnessed and profited from. Legislation has, strictly speaking, only to do with the present—that alone is its field; acting for it, however, not on seeming expediency, but on the eternal principles of truth and equity. If on such principles—if through just laws fairly administered—the nation grows populous and wealthy, whatever the future may have in store for us, legislation has done its part well. To turn the stream of national industry, to interfere with the order of nature, are works which it will not desire to meddle with. These are dreams for the closet, which any intelligent intercourse with actual things will dispel. But we need not pursue the moral of these remarkable documents. While they seem to

tell so much, and that so truly, we are aware that many of the most potent influences at work upon the national character and prospects elude the grasp of the statistician and defy the measurements of numbers, and that these might tell a far different tale than that of England's prosperity. Such sobering reflections will not have escaped the reader, though it has been beyond our plan to give them prominence here, where our only design has been to put him in possession of some of the facts brought to light by the recent Census, satisfied that they will be esteemed of interest and importance enough in themselves to dispense with elaborate comment or philosophical inquiry.

ART. II.—1. *Theologia Moralis S. Alphonsi de Ligorio, Fundatoris Congregationis SS. Redemptoris ac olim Episcopi S. Agathæ Gothorum.* Editio novissima; curavit P. MICH. HEILIG, Congr. SS. Redempt. Presbyter et Professor Theol. Moralis. Parisiis, 1845.

2. *Homo Apostolicus, sive Praxis et Instructio Confessariorum. Auctore illustrissimo et reverendissimo D. Alphonso de Ligorio,* Editio nova. Moguntiæ, 1842.

3. *Compendium Theologiæ Moralis S. Alphonsi Mariæ de Ligorio, Auctore D. Neyraguet, Presbytero Diœcesis Ruthenensis Missionario.* Liburni, 1851.

4. *A Treatise of Equivocation: wherein is largely discussed the question whether a Catholicke, or any other person, before a Magistrate, being demaunded uppon his oath whether a Prieste were in such a place, may (notwithstanding his perfect knowledge to the contrary), without perjury, and securely in conscience answere, No, with this secreat meaning reserued in his mynde, That he was not there, so that any man is bounde to detect it.* Edited by DAVID JARDINE, Esq. London, 1851.

5. *Cases of Conscience, or Lessons in Morals.* Sixth Edition. London, 1853.

PERHAPS there is scarcely anything which has had such weight in inducing a certain class of minds to pass from the communion of the Church of England to that of Rome, as a supposed holiness, and a high standard of piety, which the latter has been imagined to possess. The late Mr. Pugin's vision has floated through many a mind; 'Pleasant meadows, happy peasants, all holy 'monks, all holy priests, holy everybody—such unity and such 'charity, where every man was a Catholic.' How this opinion originated we will not linger to point out. Doubtless it arose from many sources which flowed together into one stream. The depth of religious fervency found in Roman Catholic books of prayer was compared with the sober expressions in the writings of our own Divines. The devotion apparent in the conduct of the worshippers of S. Peter's, S. Ouen, Milan, and Seville, during the time of the Easter ceremonies, at which they were alone visited, was contrasted with the frigidity of our own too often verger-governed cathedrals. Many of our writers, struggling against errors of an opposite nature, did not wait to point

out those to which their readers were not then exposed, and in drawing attention to the evils of the nineteenth century, they cared not to paint more than the bright features of the fifteenth. But, above all, 'the forward and delusive faculty' of Imagination came into play. People took to idealizing. They built themselves fairy palaces, and drew themselves fairy pictures of what the Church *must* be. Prophet and apostle were called up as witnesses, and an ideal holiness and unity were made necessary conditions of the Catholic Church. Then the eyes were turned from within to the strange scene of turmoil without, which this world of ours, and the Church militant in it, always present. The consequence was a cold shiver, and a conviction, grounded on the feelings, if not on the understanding, that this, at least, was no adequate realization of the glories depicted within. But yet the enchanted palace was not to be shivered so easily. The realization must be somewhere. True, it was not here, and therefore it must be looked for at some further spot—a spot sufficiently far removed for the mist to cover all inequalities in the appearance, and to give means of still dreaming on securely and cherishing a belief in the actual existence of the Ideal. And so, though England was fallen, yet Rome must be perfect.

This could not last long. History, and the testimony of living writers, spoke too unmistakeably. Mr. Gladstone's Letters to Lord Aberdeen cleared off a world of mist from Italy, and there were others who did the same good service for Spain and France. But even so the dream would not be cast out. The ideal, it had to be acknowledged, was not realized even there—but that might be the result of counteracting circumstances. It was the King of Naples, or the Grand Duke of Tuscany, or the Court of Spain, or the French Revolution. But still none of the evils must be traced to the Church, and the Church's own teaching and practice. She must still be, in herself, the great Perfection to which weary mortals may ever have recourse, to learn truth from her unstammering lips, and duty from her unchanging code of morals.

That the existence of such a living teacher—an ever-abiding oracle, ready to give the same responses to all comers—preaching the one true faith, and laying down one uniform system of pure and high-toned morality, is a captivating dream, cannot be denied; and if Rome is, in a special manner, such a living teacher, then the controversy between us and her is brought into very narrow compass. But we need not say that there are here two assumptions of no slight importance. Our present object shall be to examine what truth there is in the notion that Rome's

teaching does even aim at a high standard of practice: and as morality is the necessary antecedent of piety, our investigation shall be into the tone and nature of that morality which is authoritatively inculcated by the Church of Rome.

No fairer exponent of Roman teaching can be had than S. Alfonso Maria de' Liguori, as the following facts will show. In 1787 he died. In 1803 the Sacred Congregation of Rites decreed, 'that in all the writings of Alfonso de' Liguori, edited 'and inedited, there was not a word that could be justly found 'fault with.' Pius VII. ratified the decree, and proceeded, in less than thirty years after Liguori's death, to his beatification. Monsignor Artico, Bishop of Asti, and Prince Prelate of the Papal Household, published a letter declaring 'that the ex-'amination of Liguori's work had been conducted with par-'ticular severity, that his System of Morality had been more 'than twenty times discussed by the Sacred Congregation, and 'that all had agreed *voce concordi, unanimi consensu, unâ voce, 'unâ mente.*' In 1831 Cardinal de Rohan-Chabot, Archbishop of Besançon, propounded the following questions for the oracular response (*oráculum requirit*) of the Sacred Penitentiary:— '1. Whether a professor of sacred theology may with safety 'follow and profess the opinions which the Blessed Alfonso de' 'Liguori professes in his Moral Theology? 2. Whether a Con-'fessor should be disturbed for following all the opinions of the 'Blessed Alfonso de' Liguori in the confessional, simply on the 'grounds that the Holy Apostolic See had declared that it 'found nothing in his works worthy of censure?' The answer given to the first question was in the affirmative. Liguori's opinions might be followed and professed with safety. The answer to the second was in the negative. No such Confessor was to be disturbed in his course. This decision was formally signed and dated as issuing from the Sacred Penitentiary on the 5th of July, 1831. Immediately the Cardinal Archbishop wrote to his Clergy requiring 'that the judgment of Rome 'should be fully adhered to, and that the opinions of the Blessed 'Alfonso de' Liguori should be followed and reduced to prac-'tice, all doubt whatever being thrown aside.' Pope Gregory XVI. confirmed the decree in a few weeks, and in 1839 Alfonso exchanged his title of *Blessed* for that of *Saint.* His life, full of adulation, has lately been published in England with Cardinal Wiseman's approbation; and it was but last year that his *Glories of Mary* were 'cordially recommended to the faithful' by 'Nicholas Card. Wiseman, Archbishop of Westmin-'ster. Given at Westminster on the Feast of Saint Alphonsus 'de' Liguori, 1852.'

Thus we have a Roman Bishop, who has been beatified and canonized, whose works, together with all the opinions in them, have been commended by Cardinals, approved by the Sacred Congregation, and ratified by Popes. Nor has this taken place long ago. Liguori is Rome's last saint, and his teaching is, on Rome's own showing, the latest authoritative exponent of her moral system, put into the hands of her confessors and directors with her special approbation and sanction.

No more need be said to prove that if Liguori's teaching is lax, if it falls short of a high standard, if it is subversive of the plain principles of morality, Rome's teaching is so too. Our present purpose is not to exhibit the most revolting features of his books: the laws of decency would forbid that. Abstaining from all quotations which would have to be veiled under a dead language, we shall confine ourselves almost wholly to the examination of a single question, What is Rome's theory of truthfulness and of lying? This lies at the very foundation of morals. Our first extract will contain her doctrine of Amphibology.

'We must distinguish between Amphibology or Equivocation, and Mental Restriction. Amphibology can be in three fashions: 1. When a word has two senses, as the word *volo* means both *to wish* and *to fly*. 2. When a sentence bears two main meanings, as *this book is Peter's*, may mean that the book belongs to Peter, or, that Peter is the author of it. 3. When words have two senses, one more common than the other, or one literal, the other metaphorical. . . . Thus, if a man is asked about something which it is to his interest to conceal, he can answer, *No, I say;* that is, *I say the word, no.* Cardenas doubts about this, but, saving his better counsel, he seems to do so without reason, for the word *I say* really has two senses; it means *to utter* [make use of a word] and *to assert.* We here employ it in the sense of *utter.*'—4. 2. 151.

Simple examples of these three forms of equivocation would be the following:—1. 'While we were making these arrangements *the heir* was present,' meaning *the air* was present. 2. The old, 'Aio te Æacida Romanos vincere posse,' or, 'Mr. H. is a man about town,' meaning, that he is frequently in London. 3. 'Is the grass green?' If you reply 'It is not,' you have told a lie; if you answer 'No, I say,' you have used an equivocation, because you mean that you are employing the word *No.*

'Well then,' continues S. Alfonso, 'it is certain, and held by all doctors alike, that for a good reason it is allowable to use equivocation in these ways which have been explained, and to confirm it with an oath. So say Lessius, Cardenas, and the Salamanca Doctors. The reason is, that thus we do not deceive our neighbour, but, on good reason, allow him to deceive himself; and again, we are not bound to speak according to the understanding of others if there is good reason; and any honest object, such as keeping our goods spiritual or temporal, is a good reason.

'But now, if you have *not* a good reason, is it a mortal sin to swear amphibologically, or with non-pure mental restriction? Viva says so, as well as Toletus, Anglès, Armilla, Navarrus; so does Busembaum, together, as he declares, with Layman, Sanchez, and "the common opinion." But he has no right to claim Sanchez, and to call his own opinion the "common" one, for Sanchez follows the contrary, and so do Lugo, Cajetan, the Salamanca Doctors, with Soto, Valdez, Prato, Hurtado, Candido, Leandro, and Lessius; and even Busembaum thinks it "probable." This, then, is the "more probable" opinion, and the reason of it is, that in oaths of this kind there are already present truth and justice; good judgment or discrimination is all that is wanting, and the absence of that is only venial. Nor is there anything in what Viva says, that a man swearing in this way calls on God to witness to what is false, for in fact he calls upon Him to witness what is true, *according to his own meaning*, although for good reason he allows the other to be deceived by reason of his carelessness or inadvertence. This must not, however, be done in a trial, or in contracts. It is an inference from the opinion given above, that for swearing in this way, in all cases except trials or contracts, it is not necessary to have a reason of any importance in itself, but any reasonable cause is sufficient, such as to free oneself from a man's troublesome questions which he has no right to ask. Note here, however, first, that you must have a better reason for equivocating with an oath than without it; and secondly, that in proportion as the words give the more occasion for a mistake, the better the reason must be; whence they say, that when words give scarcely any reason for a mistake, like words which are simply equivocal and bear two meanings, one equally well with the other, the very lightest reason is an excuse.

'Mental Restriction is of two kinds, one purely mental, which cannot be discovered in any manner by others; the other, not purely mental, which can become known from circumstances connected with it. Purely mental restriction is never allowable, nor an oath with it, as is shown by the three propositions condemned by Innocent XI. . . . On the contrary, it is allowable to use non-pure mental restriction, even with an oath, if it can be discovered by circumstances. This is proved from John vii. 8, where Christ said, "I go not up to this feast," and yet Scripture says that He afterwards went up. He understood "I go not up *openly* (as the Disciples inquired) *but secretly*." . . . This opinion is held in common by Gonet, Layman, Paludanus, Adrian, Soto, Wigandt, Cardenas, La Croix, Holzmann, Sporer, Viva, and the Salamanca Doctors; Collet also has the same opinion, with Vanroy and Boudart, saying, that even the overstrict theologians declare that non-pure mental restrictions are not unlawful, arguing from S. Augustine, who, in his *Book against Lying*, c. 10, says, "Although every one who tells a lie may wish to conceal the truth, yet not every one who wishes to conceal what is true tells a lie." Even the extremely rigid Contensonius agrees, for in explaining the passage in John about Christ's going up to the feast, he says that Christ used somewhat obscure words, which a man of thought might easily interpret and discover the meaning. S. Thomas favours this view by saying, "that to be silent about the truth, and to express falsehood, are different things." He says, too, "It is not lawful to tell a lie for the purpose of freeing another from any kind of danger; it is lawful, however, to hide the truth prudently under some dissimulation, as S. Augustine says in his *Book against Lying*." The reason of this opinion is, that if it were not allowable to use non-pure mental restriction, there would be no way of lawfully concealing a secret which a man could not discover without loss or inconvenience, and this would be as harmful to intercourse between man and man as lying. The condemnation

passed by the pontiff on mental restriction is rightly to be understood of restriction purely and strictly taken, for that alone ought to be called true mental restriction which takes place solely in the mind, and there remains concealed, and can by no means be discovered from outward circumstances.'—4. 2. 151, 152.

We have thus stated the principles of Amphibology or Equivocation, and of Mental Restriction, in Liguori's own words. It will be seen that there are three sorts of equivocation, all of which are allowable, even with the addition of a solemn oath. Accordingly, a man may swear that *the heir* was present, meaning that *the air* was present. He may swear that another person is *a man about town*, meaning that he frequently goes to London. To the question, Is the grass green? he may answer with an oath, '*I say, no*,' meaning, not to deny the fact, but to affirm that he was using the word *No*. Mental restriction, since the days of Innocent XI., is of two sorts, pure, and non-pure. Pure mental restriction is that which, in the nature of things (*ullo modo*) is undiscoverable; non-pure mental restriction is that which, in the nature of things, is discoverable, but which, nevertheless, the person with whom we are dealing does not discover. An example of the first would be the secret insertion of a negative into an affirmative oath, *without any external sign:* an example of the second would be the secret insertion of a negative *in a whisper not observed by the other party*. Thus, 'I swear that I will do it,' with the *mental* insertion of 'not,' meaning 'I swear that I will not do it,' would be pure mental restriction; and, as such, has been condemned by Pope Innocent, and is disallowed by Liguori. But, 'I swear that I will do it,' with the insertion of 'not' *under the cover of a cough*, or with the addition of a 'perhaps' *in an unobserved whisper*, would be non-pure mental restriction, and such an oath might, according to Rome's moral teaching, be taken by a man who had no intention of fulfilling what the other party considered that he had bound himself to perform. We will presently proceed to point out the very grave effects which, on Liguori's own showing, the admission of these and like principles have on all security and good faith in dealings between man and man; on the security of oaths, of vows, of promises, of evidence; on truthfulness in general. But first we must make a few remarks suggested by the passage which has been quoted.

Three technical expressions are used, the special meaning of which it may be well to recal to our readers' minds. These are 'mortal sin,' 'probable and more probable opinions,' 'common opinion.'

For an act to be sin at all, it must fulfil three conditions. It must be voluntary, it must be free, and its wickedness must be

recognised. Those acts which fulfil these conditions are then arbitrarily divided, according to Roman teaching, into mortal and venial sins. For a sin to be mortal, it is required that the consent of the will should be perfect, that the recognition of the intellect should be full and deliberate, and that the *materia*, or thing about which the sin is, should be of a certain 'gravity.' A mortal sin puts a man out of the grace of God, a venial sin does not, but only diminishes the man's own fervour, and is so light a thing that it need never be confessed. What sins are mortal, and what venial, is left to the decision of the casuists. We will not here pause to point out the irreconcilable differences between doctors of greater and less rigidity on so vital a point as this. We may say, however, in passing, in order to show how totally impossible it is that the arbitrary division into mortal and venial can be really maintained, that after pages of patient calculation Liguori is reduced to the conclusion that a theft of 4*s.* by the same individual, and in identically the same state of mind, from a merchant of great opulence, and from a very rich nobleman, is a mortal sin in the first case, and a venial sin in the last; that is, that the first, 'on account of its own grave importance, de-'stroys favour and friendship with God, and deserves eternal 'punishment;' that the other, 'on account of its insignificant 'importance, does not take away favour and friendship, though 'it diminishes our fervour of charity, and deserves temporal 'punishment;' that the one 'takes away the principle of spiritual life,' the other is not worth confessing. Again, we find that the sin committed by a nobleman's son in stealing 10*l.* from his father, is a venial sin, but that once to omit attending mass on Sunday is mortal.

Pascal will explain to us the doctrine of Probable Opinions in his own inimitable manner:—

'"The generality of our authors," said the monk, "and, among others, our four-and-twenty elders, thus explain it: 'An opinion is called probable when it is founded upon reasons of some consideration. Hence it may sometimes happen that a single very grave Doctor may render an opinion probable.'... Hear Sanchez, one of the most famous of our Fathers: 'You may doubt, perhaps, whether the authority of a single good and learned Doctor renders an opinion probable. I answer that it does; and this is confirmed by Angelus, Sylvester, Navarre, Emanuel Sa, &c.' ... You don't understand it! No doubt Doctors are often of different sentiments, but what signifies that? Each renders his own opinion probable and safe. We all know well enough that they are far from being of the same mind; what is more, they scarcely ever agree. There are very few questions indeed in which you do not find the one saying Yes, and the other saying No. Still, in all these cases, each of the contrary opinions is probable. And hence Diana says: 'Ponce and Sanchez hold opposite views of it; but as they are both learned men, each renders his own opinion probable.'"

'"But father," I remarked, "a person must be sadly embarrassed in choosing between them!" "Not at all," he rejoined; "he has only to follow the opinion which suits him best." "What if the other is more probable?" "It does not signify." "And if the other is safer?" "It does not signify," repeated the monk; "this is made quite plain by Emanuel Sa of our Society, in his Aphorisms: 'A person may do what he considers allowable according to a probable opinion, though the contrary may be the safer one. The opinion of a single grave doctor is all that is requisite.'" "And if an opinion be at once the less probable and the less safe, is it allowable to follow it," I asked, "even in the way of rejecting one which we believe to be more probable and more safe?" "Once more I say, Yes," replied the monk. "Hear what Filiutius, that great Jesuit of Rome, says: 'It is allowable to follow the less probable opinion, even though it be the less safe one. That is the common judgment of modern authors.' Is not that quite clear?"

'"Well, reverend father," said I, "you have given us sinners enough room, at all events! Thanks to your probable opinions, we have liberty of conscience with a vengeance! But are your casuists allowed the same latitude in giving your responses?" "O yes," said he, "we answer just as we please; or rather, I should say, just as it may please those who ask our advice. Here are our rules." . . . "Well, seriously, father," I said, "your doctrine is an uncommonly agreeable one! Only think of being allowed to answer Yes or No, just as you please! It is impossible to prize such a privilege too highly. I see now the advantage of the conflicting opinions of your doctors. One of them is always ready to serve your purpose, and the other never gives you any annoyance. If you do not find your account on the one side, you fall back on the other, and always land in perfect safety." "That is quite true," he replied, "and, accordingly, we may always say with Diana, on finding that Father Bauny was on his side, while Father Lugo was against him: *Sæpe premente Deo fert Deus alter opem.*"'—Letter V.

In like manner Garnet, in the 'Treatise of Equivocation,' lays it down as certain 'that when both opinions are probable, 'a man may without sinne folow either, if it may be done with-'out prejudice of our neighbour,' and 'that it is within the 'compasse of probability, if it have two or three grave autours.'

A 'common opinion' is supposed to be that on which all or most doctors agree. We say *supposed*, because, except on points where neither obtuseness nor over-subtlety of intellect could fail of coming to the right conclusion, they never do agree; nor is even a respectable majority found on one side or the other. In other words, when their agreement might be of use, it never exists; so irreconcilable are the differences between the strict and the lax schools. No one can read a dozen pages of Liguori without finding that, whatever may be said of Rome's dogmatic precepts, his dream of anything like certainty in her moral teaching has passed away for ever. This doctor is opposed to that doctor, while the third and fourth agree with neither of them, nor with themselves, and the inquirer at the oracle finds, to his dismay, that he is left with a mass of opinions of all shades of

difference, out of which he may take his choice, or his director may choose for him.

We cannot pass over the inferences drawn from the quotations made in the passage which we have extracted without some criticism. These quotations are made from our Lord's words, as related in the Gospels, from S. Augustine, and from Thomas Aquinas. From the first two an inference is drawn that non-pure mental restriction is allowable, and the third is given as favourable to the same view. Let us see if such an inference can fairly be drawn from the words.

'I go not up to this feast,' said our Lord, understanding, adds Liguori, by non-pure mental restriction, 'openly, but I do go up secretly.' An appeal to the words of Him who was and is the Truth, for the purpose of showing that He used towards His brethren a form of expression the effect of which would inevitably be to deceive them, is grating to our moral feelings. If any other hypothesis would satisfy the account in the Gospel narrative, we cannot doubt that it would be the part of reverence to accept it in place of this explanation. Not only, however, are there more natural explanations of the words, but they will not even bear this explanation. Let us turn to the original, and what do we find? *Ὑμεῖς ἀνάβητε εἰς τὴν ἑορτήν· ἐγὼ οὔπω ἀναβαίνω εἰς τὴν ἑορτὴν ταύτην, ὅτι ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ἐμὸς οὔπω πεπλήρωται.* 'Go *ye* up to the feast. *I* am not *yet* going up to this feast, because *my* time is not *yet* fully come.' Accordingly, when it *was* fully come, he went up, and *τῆς ἑορτῆς μεσούσης*, when the feast was about half over, began to teach. But it may be said that the reading *οὔπω ἀναβαίνω* is not found in all the MSS. True, in the Codex Vaticanus, the Codex Bezæ, and the Codex Cyprius, the reading is *οὐκ ἀναβαίνω*. But the authority of these three Codices, important as the first two are, cannot be equal, or nearly equal to that of all the rest; and further, if the reading were *οὐκ* instead of *οὔπω*, the sense would remain identically the same. To get any other meaning out of the words, the tense of *ἀναβαίνω* must be changed (for as it stands it cannot avow any intention or purpose of not going up, but merely a present act), and the second *οὔπω* must also be got rid of, for which there is not a shadow of an excuse in a single MS. '*My* time,' says our Lord (*ὁ ἐμὸς* is used as distinguishing it from that of his brethren who were urging him to go and manifest himself at once) 'is not yet fully come; therefore I am not yet going up [*οὔπω*], or, I am not at present going up [*οὐκ*] to this feast.' The *οὐκ ἀναβαίνω* of the three MSS. combined with the *οὔπω πεπλήρωται*, equally with the general reading *οὔπω*, overthrows the unworthy hypothesis

that our Blessed Lord was using non-pure mental restriction.[1] S. Augustine, in a sermon on the passage, rejects by anticipation the Liguorian interpretation with indignation and horror. He would sooner believe that Christ was deceived Himself than that He was deceiving others; '*falli enim pertinet ad infirmitatem, mentiri ad iniquitatem.*' But the plain words of Scripture, he continues, show that He was neither deceived nor deceiving. And this he says with the reading '*non* ascendo' before him, and unconscious that the true reading was probably *nondum*, which would of course have strengthened his argument.[2] Even if it had been necessary to understand 'not openly but secretly,' what need could there have been of supposing that our Lord was *taking in* His brethren? Even in that case, it would have been more natural to conceive that they understood His meaning, and thus, again, there would be no case of non-pure mental restriction. At any rate, if it had been mental restriction at all, it would not have been *non-pure* but *pure* mental restriction; for the difference between the two we have seen to consist in this,

[1] This case is thus put in the 'Treatise of Equivocation:'—'The words are to be expounded thus; "I will not go upp yet," or, "to this feast," or, "I will not go with you," or, "manifestly as the Messiah, but in secrett;" which is an evident defence of our cause, for the use of such propositions which have somewhat reserved or understoode in the mynde for theire verification . . .

'First we must examine whether in the speech of our Saviour, "Ego autem non ascendo ad diem festum hunc," the word *ascendo* have the force of the present tense or the future; for albeit in some texts it be *ascendam*, yet the best Vulgate edition and all the Greeke have the present tense. Yet, notwithstanding, I say that it hath the force of a future; as if our Saviour had sayed, "Non ascendam," I will not go upp . . . This is a thinge well knowen to the grammarians, who have a certaine figure which they call Enallage, one kynd wherof is Enallage temporum, when one tense is putt for another, whereof we may read in Lynacre and Emanuell's grammar, and such as have written on figures at large . . .

'Secondly, we must determine whether our Saviour sayd, "Non ascendo," or "nondum ascendo;" for if he sayed, "I go not upp yet to this feast, there is then not so great strength in this argument by the force of the words themselves as would otherwise be. Although it be very probable that our Saviour spoke in sort that his brethren understoode that he would not go at all at that feast, insomuch that we may very well take those words, "Nondum ascendo ad diem festum hunc," that he would not go at all at this tyme. And so the argument may still be of force, for he sayed he would not go, and yet afterward he went . . . So that we probably defend that our Saviour used such words (although he sayed nondum) as made them understand that he would not come to that feast, and yet went after, which, if it be so, it skylleth not whether we read *non* or *nondum*. But letting this passe, I saye that albeit in all the Greeke copyes now extant it be *οὔπω*, *nondum*, and so did S. Chrysostome and Eutimius reade, yet did S. Cirill, a Greeke authour, read negatively *non*. Also all the Latyn ffathers reade *non*, and therfore the very Heretickes themselves oughte to admitte this readinge, at the least so far forth as to seeke out some sufficient and trewe exposition therof; and all Catholickes are bounde to admitte *non*, because so it is in the Vulgate edition. Then doth it remaine that our Saviour Christe, sayinge that he would not go and going after, did reserve some secret words to make a perfect explycation of his trew meaninge.'—Pp. 37—41.

[2] S. Aug. Serm. 133, vol. v. p. 739.

that the last takes place solely in the mind, and can by no means be discovered from outward circumstances; which would have been the case in the present instance: while the first can become known from the circumstances connected with it; which would *not* have been the case in the present instance. Either, then, our Lord's words have nothing to do with mental restriction, which we have shown to be undoubtedly the case, or if they have, they go to justify not *non-pure*, but *pure* mental restriction, which, however, Liguori declares to be never allowable, and Pope Innocent XI. has condemned.

The other quotations may be, for the present, at least, more summarily dismissed. S. Augustine writes, 'Although every one who tells a lie may wish to conceal what is true, yet not every one who wishes to conceal what is true tells a lie.' Most assuredly; for they either speak the truth against their wishes, or they are silent; they do *not* employ non-pure mental restriction, whereby they would tell a lie and pass off a juggle on themselves to boot, vainly persuading themselves that in some way or other the self-juggle made amends for the lie. When such a sentence as the above is brought forward for the purpose of inferring from S. Augustine's authority that non-pure mental reservation is justifiable, we cannot be surprised that the following statement of Thomas Aquinas is tortured into being 'favourable' to the same conclusion:—'To be silent about the truth, and to express falsehood, are different things.' The doctrine of non-pure mental restriction may be fathered on Augustine and Aquinas in virtue of these quotations with as much truth as they might be attributed to any other writer who has happened to make use of the words truth and falsehood in the same sentence. But our author is not remarkable for the pertinency or accuracy of his quotations. In his 'Glories of Mary' he has made innumerable extracts from early writers, 'not only,' as he says, 'for use, but also that they may show the high idea that the 'saints had of the power and mercy of Mary, and the great con-'fidence they had in her patronage.' A critic is obliged to warn his simpler co-religionists that they must not use the book in controversy, for, 'to name but one, and that not the chief cause of 'this unfitness, it is only necessary to mention that S. Alphonsus 'did not scruple to make most important additions to the passages 'which he quoted from the Fathers; and this, though perfectly 'allowable in a book of meditations' (*Populus vult decipi et decipiatur*), 'of course destroys its value as a work of authority in 'matters of controversy'—because, we presume, a moderately informed opponent might be inconvenient.

What lies at the foundation of the theory of Amphibology is clearly a confusion between moral and material falsehood. The

that all sin is deceitfulness and a lie: the speaker has done wrong in saying what he has said: therefore he has committed a sin: therefore he has told a lie: therefore he should say, *I made a mistake—I have told a lie.* Thus he is taught to say that the truth which he had spoken was a lie, thereby, of course, telling a lie, while at the same time he lays the flattering unction to his soul that he has been guiltless of any kind of falsehood. Again, the nature of the principle of equivocation is illustrated by the case of a servant saying *Not at home.* Cardenas says that he must put his foot upon a stone, and say that his master is not *here, i.e.* on the stone. Liguori, however, prefers his saying 'He is not *here,*' meaning at the door, or in the window, or in sight.[1] Everybody knows that conventional sayings, such as that under discussion, bear conventional meanings, and are known to bear conventional meanings, and therefore involve no deceit and no moral falsehood. Liguori thinks that because the phrase *Not at home* is materially false, the person who uses it is guilty of a moral falsehood. To escape this evil he suggests an equivocation, which makes the expression materially true, but implies an attempt at deceiving, and involves moral falsehood. So pitiably confused is this model-instructor of confessors and directors on this vital point.

The principle of non-pure mental restriction is the same. In illustration of this we will give an instance, not indeed found in Liguori, but accepted by Roman controversialists as a faithful exponent of their views, and justified as such. As S. Francis of Assisi was one day walking, he was passed by a person whom he recognised. Hardly was this person out of sight, when there came by others in search of him, and asked S. Francis if he had passed by. The saint did not wish to say Yes. His conscience forbade him to say No. What was he to do? He threw his arms into the air, brought his hands together, and in so doing pointed with his finger down his sleeve. Then he answered with a safe conscience, 'He has not passed *this* way.' It was quite true: he had not passed down the saint's sleeve. But was S. Francis therefore guiltless of a moral falsehood because he had contrived to convey that moral falsehood by means of a material truth? Yes, say Rome's casuists, because he used *non-pure* mental reservation. Had he not pointed down his sleeve, it would have been a case of *pure* mental reservation: but the adroit movement of the finger altogether withdrew the act from this class of sins, and placed it among justifiable and right acts. S. Francis' soul would, according t their system, have become 'spiritually dead,' had it not been fc

[1] Theol. Moral. 4. 2. 165.

to know whether he came from London or no. This man, the very light of nature would clear from perjury.'—P. 30.

'Three ways are assigned by doctors whereby a man may restore another's character when he has made public a crime of his which he has committed. . . . The third is, for the speaker to assert "that he had said what was false, that he had made a mistake, that he was deceived, or that he had lied." And though Soto, Cajetan, Bannez, and Sylvius, say that this way must not be used, thinking that these are real lies, yet "probably" Lugo, Sanchez, Wigandt, Lessius, Roncaglia, Mazzotta, with the "common" opinion, as he says, and the Salamanca doctors, with Villalobos, Trulenchius, Ledesma, Serra, Tapia, Prado, Sayrus, Navarrus, think that the aforesaid words are not lies but real amphibologies; for, as S. Thomas says, "Some sins are called in Scripture falsehoods and lies, as in the fourth Psalm, 'Why do ye love vanity and seek after a lie?' And there is the same in Jeremiah viii. 10, 'From the prophet to the priest they all perform a lie,' *i.e.* sins. In like manner, then, a man who has sinned, [or done wrong, which the individual in question has, by divulging a truth when he ought not to have divulged it,] can well say 'that he has told a lie,' or 'made a mistake.'" So in the case which we have put, we may well, nay, if there is need, we are bound, to make use of such ambiguous words.'—*Theol. Mor.* 4. 6. 992.

'We are not bound, says Cardenas, with Lessius, to answer to the meaning of the man who asks the question, if there is good reason,'—4. 2. 165.

'If a man has received a loan, and afterwards repaid it, he may say that he has not received the loan, understanding aside, so as to have to pay it.'—4. 2. 159.

'Whenever a man is bound to hide another man's disgrace, he may lawfully say, I do not know, namely, (aside) I have no knowledge which is of use for answering: or, I do not know it as a thing which I can declare.'—4. 2. 153.

'If a guest is asked if his dinner is good when really it is bad, he may answer that it is good, namely, (aside) for mortification.'—4. 2. 160.

Utinam his nugis!—We call attention to the following case, and the reasoning upon which it is founded:—

'May an unfaithful wife declare to her husband that she has not committed adultery, meaning (aside) so as to have to tell him? She may equivocally assert that she has not broken the marriage, for it still exists. And if she has sacramentally confessed her adultery, she may answer, "I am innocent of this crime;" because it has already been taken away by confession. So Cardenas, who remarks, however, that she may not make that affirmation with an oath, because, for asserting anything, probability of the fact is sufficient, but for swearing, certainty is required. But it is replied that moral certainty is enough for swearing, as we said above with the Salamanca doctors, Lessius, Suarez, Sanchez, and the common opinion. And this moral certainty of the remission of the sin can be had whenever a person has received the sacrament of penance in a good moral disposition. But for the question in hand, the Salamanca doctors say, with Soto, that a woman cannot deny her adultery, because it would be *pure* mental restriction. Cardenas, however, admits that in danger of death it is allowable for her to use a metaphor which is common in Scripture, where adultery is taken for idolatry, as in Ezek. xxiii. 37, "That they have committed adultery . . . and with their idols have they committed adultery." Nay, if the crime is really hidden, "probably," with Busembaum, Lessius, Trulenchius, Sanchez, Soto, Sayrus, and Peter of

only in the way of honour, and not in the way of civil law; that is, in the way of justice, as the Salamanca doctors explain.'—*Ibid.*

'The whole of the obligation commonly depends on the intention of the person making the promise. On this point Sa notices that scarcely any one who makes a promise intends to bind himself, or to give another the right of exacting, unless he adds an oath or makes an instrument, but generally only intends to declare his purpose.'—*Ibid.*

'In case a man has seduced a maiden on false promise of marriage, is he bound to keep the promise, if he is much superior to the woman in birth, and she was aware of the disparity? Palao, Pontius, Croix, Layman, Navarrus, Vasquez, &c. hold that simple inequality is not enough to free the man from his promise of marriage, but that the girl must, besides, have been able to have seen the deceit by other circumstances, for men do very often marry women beneath themselves in rank: but with great 'probability' he is excused by Busembaum, Lugo, Sanchez, S. Antoninus, Navarrus, Sylvester, Angelus, Armendarius, and very many others, on the grounds that disparity of state is of itself a reason for prudently doubting the truth of the promise; and if the woman did not doubt, as she ought, that is an accident, and to be imputed to her own carelessness. . . . And in these cases a man is not bound to marriage, although he has confirmed his promise with an oath, as is said by Lugo, Sanchez, S. Antoninus, Sylvester, Cajetan, Soto, Navarrus, and very many others. The reason of this is that an oath does not bind except according to the intention of the promiser.

'But how great ought the disparity to be, to free a man from the marriage? Lessius requires him to be of far higher birth; as that *he* should be the son of an Earl and *she* the daughter of an artizan. But Sanchez, with S. Antoninus and Navarrus, says that a much smaller inequality is sufficient, as that a noble should have to marry a farmer's daughter, or that the man should be considerably the richer of the two, as Sanchez adds with Navarrus, Lopez, Antony of Cordova, Veracruz, and Lessius. For thus speaks Navarrus in his Manual: "He is bound to fulfil his promises, except they should be very unequal in birth, power, or riches; say, that he should be noble and she a farmer's or artizan's daughter." S. Antoninus teaches likewise that he must keep his promise, except their condition in life should be very different; say, that the woman should be a plebeian and the man a noble and powerful.

'But in case the girl is totally ignorant of any disparity, is the seducer then bound to the marriage? Lessius and Busembaum say so 'probably,' because then the woman could not in any way discover the deception, but still it is 'very probably' denied by Lugo, Viva, the Salamanca doctors, Cornejo, Sanchez, Antony of Cordova, Moneta, Peter, Ledesma, and Veracruz. The grounds are that the seducer is only bound to what is equal to the injury offered: but the injury offered consists in his not fulfilling what the woman asked: so to repair the injury the man is not bound to give more than the woman asked. Now the woman, not knowing the man's condition in life, only asked that one of the same condition with herself or a little superior should marry her: if therefore a man of much better condition should marry her, he would be giving more than is equal to the injury done, by giving what she neither asked nor intended to ask: and so he is not bound to marry her, but he does quite enough if he repairs the harm done by giving her a dowry or looking after her marriage.

'The same is the case, according to Sanchez, S. Antoninus, and the Salamanca doctors, if there is fear of great offence or quarrels between the relatives of the contracting parties. In a case where a man's family would feel disgraced by the marriage on account of the disparity of state, I think him to be not the least bound to marry the maiden whom he has seduced,

judge with an oath that he has not contracted the marriage, namely, freely, as was right.'[1]—4. 2. 159.

'May a man, when asked to lend money, swear that he has none, when he has, understanding aside, that he has none so as to lend? The Salamanca doctors and Soto say No, on the ground that this mental restriction cannot be detected from circumstances. But this is only to be understood if the truth can in no way be detected; for if it could be conjectured from any circumstance, as the poverty or indigence of the lender, he may without difficulty understand I have not more than I want, so as to lend.'—4. 2. 163.

'May tradesmen swear that their goods cost them more than they did, understanding aside, "together with some other goods?" Some say they may; but the Salamanca doctors are right in denying it. Yet Croix and Gobat say that probably they may, when they do not understand the mere price of the thing, but count into it the expenses of carriage, store, &c.'—4. 2. 164.

'May men proceeding to their doctors' degree swear with equivocation that they have fufilled some condition which they have not fulfilled, as that they have been engaged for so many years on a certain science, if they are equally fit with the other doctors to proceed? See Tamburini, who answers in the affirmative, and says that there is then a good reason for swearing, lest men who are really worthy should be rejected, But however this may be, it seems a matter more than 'probable' to me that men proceeding to their doctors' degrees in Naples do not commit perjury when, as is usual, they write with their own hands, "I declare with an oath that it is the first year, &c." when it really is not; because the words "I swear," or "I declare with an oath," (as we said above with the Salamanca doctors, Bonacina, Sanchez, and Suarez,) is not an oath in itself, unless it is preceded by a question about swearing, and this question at Naples is either not made at all, or is not made about the real oath, but only about the material writing, which, from common usage, does not seem to be counted as a true oath.'—4. 2. 166.

'Is it allowable to swear something false, adding in a low tone a true circumstance? Yes, answer Hurtado and Prado, with others quoted by the Salamanca doctors against Torre. They say that it is enough to make the words true, that there should be some external conformity with the conception of the mind, whether shown by gesture or by a whisper, and it is a matter of accident that the other does not hear. The Salamanca doctors explain it better. They say that it is allowable if the whisper can by any means be possibly perceived by the other, although its meaning is not caught, but not if it should in every respect remain concealed from him.'—4. 2. 168.[2]

---

[1] This example is thus enlarged in the 'Treatise of Equivocation.' 'One being 'convented in the Bishopp's courte because he refuse to take such a one to his 'wyfe as he had contracted with *per verba de præsenti*, having contracted with 'another privily before, so that he cannot be husband to her that claymeth him, 'may answere that he never contracted with her *per verba de præsenti*, under-'standing, that he did not so contract that it was a marriage.'—P. 81.

[2] Our readers will recollect Pascal's method of dealing with this doctrine:—'Indeed, father, is that not a lie and perjury too?' 'No,' said the father, 'Sanchez and Filiutius prove that it is not; "for," says the latter, "it is the intention that determines the quality of the action." And he suggests a still surer method for avoiding falsehood, which is this: after saying aloud, *I swear that I have not done that*, to add in a low voice, *to-day;* or after saying aloud, *I swear*, to interpose in a whisper *that I say*, and then continue aloud *that I have done that.* This, you perceive, is telling the truth.' 'I grant it,' said I, 'it might possibly, however, be found to be telling the truth in a low key, and falsehood in a loud one.'—Letter IX.

circumstances connected with it; for an oath cannot be a bond of iniquity, or of vain and idle things to which God does not wish us to be bound. Bonacina and others, according to the common opinion.'—4. 2. 176.

We must recollect that the judge of what is bad, vain, idle, or indifferent, is the Director, and therefore that no oath of which he disapproves is to be kept.

'Is a man who promises his concubine with an oath not to know another woman bound to keep his promise? Diana says No; but the Salamanca doctors with greater probability say Yes.'—4. 2. 184.

'Is a man who has made a promissory oath to return to prison bound to keep his promise, with a probable fear of death, or very grave unjust wrong? The first opinion says No, because it is an action intrinsically bad to offer oneself to death. So say Navarrus, Manriquez, Vasquez, Pontius, Covarruvias, Tamburini, Reginald. The second opinion with much more probability is in the affirmative, because when the promise had been made, it would be a work of virtue to go back. So Toletus, Suarez, Lessius, and the Salamanca doctors, though they call the first opinion probable.'—4. 2. 186.

Poor Regulus! We used to admire his conduct, and to think that he had acted gloriously, as we read over and over Horace's spirit-stirring ode when we were at school; but it seems that, in the judgment of Navarrus, Manriquez, Vasquez, Pontius, Covarruvias, Tamburini, and Reginald, he was doing a thing wicked in itself,—and the doctors who maintain the contrary still think it not improbable. Pity that our minds were not imbued with Liguorian morality after the fashion which has been lately proposed in France. Let Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle bow before our modern moralists!

There is another sort of swearing, which we who are accustomed to the Third Commandment and to our Lord's discourses in the Gospels have been inclined to consider wrong;—but away with scruples: 'We must mark that generally men who angrily 'utter words, such as, *By God! By Christ! I will kill you!* 'commit no grave sin, as they are for the most part excused 'on the ground of ignorance or want of deliberation.'—4. 2. 146.

This is sickening work. We will pass over vows which are treated much in the same way as oaths. But at least it may be thought that, in solemn courts of justice, men will be allowed to give their evidence without this miserable dallying with their consciences and sense of truth: there, at least, they will not be justified in lying. Let us see.

'A witness or defendant, when not legitimately questioned by the judge, may swear that he does not know a crime which he really does know, understanding to himself that he does not know a crime about which he can be legitimately questioned, or that he does not know it so as to give evidence about it. So Cajetan, Sporer, Azorinus, Roncaglia, Sanchez, with Navarrus, Toletus, Valentia, &c. The same is the case if the witness, for some other reason, is not bound to give evidence; for example, if he is himself quite assured that the act committed is without guilt, as the Salamanca doctors and

Elbel say; or if he knows the crime only as a secret, and no ill repute has previously got abroad. When, however, the witness or defendant is legitimately questioned by the judge, he must not use any equivocation, because he is bound to obey the rightful precept of his superior. This is the common opinion; and the same must be said about an oath in onerous contracts, because otherwise injury would be done to another. Except in the case of a trial the crime be altogether concealed; for then a witness may, nay *he is bound to say that the defendant has not committed it*, and so may the defendant if there is not half-full proof. So says Tamburini, with the common opinion, because then the judge does not question legitimately.'—4. 2. 154.

Can we any longer wonder at its being impossible to get evidence in Ireland, upon which to convict murderers?

'But it is asked, if a defendant or contractor, who is not permitted the use of equivocation, has deceived by equivocally swearing, can he be absolved without declaring the truth? Some say No, not without probability; but with more probability Sanchez, the Salamanca doctors, and Philiarchus say Yes, because by such an oath, which cannot be called perjury, he has not sinned against commutative justice, but against legal justice, and the obedience due to the judge, whose command to discover the truth is only transient, and only lasts as long as he is making the inquiry. Sanchez says the same, also, about a lying witness; and so both of them may be absolved without their declaring the truth. They are, however, bound to make satisfaction in another way, if they can. If they cannot, the Salamanca doctors say that they are bound to discover the truth afresh in the court. But I should even excuse them, if they were altogether unable to make satisfaction either at present or at a future time.'—4. 2. 155.

Our readers will inquire what is the meaning of legitimate questioning on the part of the judge. In the next book Liguori explains his meaning.

'It is certain that a witness is not bound to confess the truth to a judge, when he does not legitimately interrogate; for then he may lawfully answer, even with an oath, that he does not know the crime (aside) so as to be bound to declare it to him. But it is asked, when does a judge question legitimately? The reply is, when there is already half-full proof. . . . When there is this, the crime is no longer said to be secret, and therefore the judge has a right that the witness should declare the truth. So in common, Lessius, Navarrus, and others, with the Salamanca doctors, who observe that no witness is bound to answer in this way, unless repute of the guilt, or half-full evidence of it, or clear signs of it, be already proved and shown to him by the judge, unless, indeed, it is quite certain that the judge is a good man, and he declares that he is legitimately questioning. . . . A judge does not legitimately question, unless there has previously been notoriety, ill repute, or other half-full proof.'—5. 3. 266.

In the same spirit the Treatise of Equivocation explains 'the order of law, which order of law requires these five things:'—

'First, that the party who examineth must be a lawfull superiour . . . Secondly, he must have authority over the person whom he examineth . . . Thirdly, the matter itself must be subject to the judge . . . Fourthly, he must procede according to a just law: for whereas a judge is, as Aristotle calls hym, a living law, as the law itself is a dumb judge; even as the law when it is unjust is no law, so a judge, in the execution of an unjust law, is no judge. Fynally it is very necessary, for the due observation of order

of law, that the judge do not proceede against a man to examine hym or call hym into question, but in cases which are publick and manifest, or when great suspicions and presumptions or common reportes, do seem to condemn the partye, or sufficient testimony convince hym, for otherwise it were against the law of nature. For how can there be greater disturbance of commonwealth than to have honest men molested or called into question at any one's fancye? . . . In these cases, when order of law is not observed, a man is not only not bound to confesse anything of hymself, but he is also bound to confesse nothing at all, for it were to prejudice hymself without necessitye. And no man may prejudice his own fame, or goodes, or lyfe, without at the least a veniall synne, except he be bound thereunto by order of law.'—P. 68.

Liguori continues:—

'Even when legitimately and juridically interrogated, you are not bound to give evidence in the following cases. . . . 3. If notable harm will result to yourself or any belonging to you from your testimony. . . . 6. If the man probably did not commit sin in what he did, either owing to ignorance, or because he took something by way of compensation for a debt, and for doing so was charged with theft. For the judge's intention is to inquire about what is really a guilty action.'—*Theol. Mor.* 5. 3. 268.

'Bonacina says that if a witness has sworn to speak the truth, he is bound to speak it on the grounds of justice, because an obligation of justice arises from an oath and promise; but with greater probability Lessius contradicts him, because a witness swearing that he will speak the truth, does not intend to bind himself to declare it on the grounds of justice, but only by virtue of religious scruple.'—5. 3. 270.

'Is a witness bound to make restitution for the harm that has ensued, if he has concealed the truth when legitimately questioned by the judge? Yes, say the Salamanca doctors. . . . No, says Molina, &c. . . . But you will say that if a man has, by his lie, hindered another from obtaining a good to which the latter has a right, he is bound to make restitution, and that so the witness is bound to make restitution, because he has hindered his neighbour from getting his rights by saying that he did not know what he did know, which was a lie. But it is replied that this holds when the lie is the positive cause which produces the harm, not if it is only the negative cause. Now, a witness who says that he does not know some true thing which he does know, is only the negative cause of harm; for he puts no positive impediment in the way of the other man's getting his rights, he only does not remove an impediment in his way, which impediment is defect of proof. This impediment a witness may be bound to remove, from obedience and religious scruple, as we said, or even sometimes from charity, but not from justice, unless it has happened that he has entered into a special compact with that side that he will divulge the truth.'—5. 3. 270.

We are told a little further on, that a witness commits a crime in five ways, one of which is, If he discovers the truth which he ought to conceal. Who would not have expected the very converse of this proposition?—If he conceals the truth which he ought to discover? But what wonder that barefaced lying should be taught and justified, in courts where barefaced bribery is approved? Two extracts on this head, as it is not immediately connected with our subject, shall suffice.

'May a judge take money to despatch the cause of one man before another? Layman says that, looking to natural right, he does not dare to condemn it, because the new obligation which he undertakes is worth pay-

ment. The Salamanca doctors, however, more truly say the contrary, because a judge is bound on grounds of justice to be speedy in despatching the causes of all who have an equal right to despatch; unless he should take any extraordinary trouble which he was not bound by his office to take.'—5. 3. 196.

'Does a man commit a sin who offers bribes to a judge, or to his ministers? *Distingue.* If he give without good reason, he commits sin by co-operating in an unlawful receiving, but not if he gives with a reason, namely, to free himself from annoyance which he does not deserve: but he must take care that there is a probable risk of his otherwise suffering manifest injustice; for then it is not a case of corrupting another, but of taking care that his own rights are awarded to himself. So in common, Sanchez, Lugo, Molina, Antony of Cordova, Palao, and the Salamanca doctors, against Ledesma. Nor are the prohibitory laws any objection; for what the laws intend is to provide against men giving money, and so corrupting the judges by bribes, not to prevent them from getting a just sentence.'—5. 3. 212.

Is it strange that the courts of justice are what they are in Spain, in Rome, in Naples? Look at the case of witnesses. The distinction between legitimate and non-legitimate interrogation is enough to destroy all hopes of arriving at the truth. If a man is anxious to conceal the truth, he has only to say to himself that the judge is questioning illegitimately, and then he has no obligation to speak the truth. Even when that door is closed, and he acknowledges the legitimacy of the interrogation, he is still allowed to settle in his own mind whether the fact which he has witnessed was to the individual agent a sin; and if he determines that it was not, he may deny that it was done at all. Then, if he acknowledges that it is a sin, he must ask himself if any one else knows of it; and if it is known to himself alone, *he is bound to lie*, and say that he does *not* know it, or even *that the culprit has not done it*. And when, at last, he is bid to tell the truth, it is not on the grounds of the sacredness of truthfulness, but on the principle into which Rome resolves every duty —obedience to positive precept. Look again at the litigants; they may bribe almost at pleasure, but must take care (by a direction of the intention, we presume) to be not corrupting the judge, but only getting their own rights. And look at the judge; he may without scruple receive bribes for despatching causes, according to the laxer opinion (which, however, is quite sufficient to justify him in acting), in virtue of the new obligation into which he has entered—according to the stricter view, on account of any special trouble that he may take. Can degradation be lower? Can rottenness be more loathsome? And this is morality!

We feel that our readers have seen sufficient to be assured that Rome and her casuists have cut away every tie of obligation contracted by assertion, promises, vows, and oaths; that they have done away with all confidence that we could put in the word of their genuine disciples, under whatever sanctions

guaranteed; and that, so far as they are able, they reduce society to its elements, where every man's hand is against his neighbour, and each person looks out for a snare concealed behind the specious acts and words of every other.

The line of defence assumed by Roman doctors is uniformly the same. Each man has a right, they say, to act upon the defensive; he has a right to keep guard over the knowledge which he has, in the same way that he may defend his goods; and, as for there being any deceit in the matter—why, soldiers use stratagems in war, and opponents use feints in fencing.[1]

We have already pointed out that the use of equivocation and mental restriction is allowed aggressively, as well as on the defensive, but we will pass that by, and examine this argument on its own grounds as chosen by our opponents. It will be seen that there are two things asserted. The first is, that we may keep guard over our knowledge, and not necessarily give it up to every one who asks questions of us. This is no doubt true, *provided that we use no unjustifiable means for doing so*, in the same way that we may defend our goods, not by every means good or bad, *but only by righteous means.* The second thing asserted is, that all kinds of equivocation and non-pure mental restriction are justifiable means, and this is argued for on the grounds that similar measures are taken in war, and its imitation, fencing.

But mark what this implies. No less than that we are living under the curse of Ishmael—that we are always at war with every one about us—that we are fencing—that we look upon our brother-Christians and countrymen as enemies, whom, as in the battle-field or in the gymnastic-room, (where such dealings are expected, and therefore free from culpability,) we may fairly take in by feints, and stratagems, and amphibologies. We are thankful to know that Englishmen do not regard one another in this light; but wherever this state of society does exist, there the natural consequence is lying. In several continental countries this is so. In Spain, for example, the mere fact of asking the simplest question does impose upon the speaker the character of an aggressor and assailant. We have jogged along the roads of Spain, talking amicably and frankly with a chance passenger. Presently, by way of conversation, we have asked a question,

[1] This is the traditional line of defence, handed down from times past to the present day. Thus in Parsons' *Treatise tending towards Mitigation* we find,—'And here I ask Thomas Morton further what he will say to all the stratagems in 'war, for so much as there may be as well lying in facts as in words, according as 'our S. Thomas and other divines do hold? How will T. M. excuse their strata-'gems, that is to say, policies, deceits, and dissimulations of enemies in wars, from 'lies? Will he condemn all such stratagems as sinful? Why, then, do the Pro-'testant captains and leaders use them?'—P. 290.

Donde se va? Immediately there has fallen a cloud of suspicion on the traveller's face: he has curtly replied with the name of some place far from his present direction, and then the conversation has ended; he has pushed on or dropped behind, and would have no more to say. Indeed, it is one of the arts of the guides, by which a good guide is known from an indifferent one, to be ready with a plausible lie in regard to the direction of his master's journey, when questions are asked at the posadas. The reason of this is, that men feel at war with one another. And so in Italy, lying is taught on the grounds that the inquirer must be dealt with by stratagem. The following anecdote is given in a note to the fourth chapter of Cases of Conscience:—

'The Abbate Bricconi was tutor to the son of an English Roman Catholic gentleman of the old school. One day in Rome, explaining the liberty of simulation, he said, "Suppose I am going to Naples, but do not wish it to be known where I am going, and my interrogator has no right to question me, I answer, I am going to Genoa." "*Ma Signor Abbate,*" said the noble English boy, but half a Papist, "*mi pare questo sarebbe una bugia.*" He was called an *impertinente*, and given a good penance.'—P. 77.

It may be that if Liguorian morality spread, (and let us recollect that it is the morality which is taught in every Romish confessional in England,) this happy state of war and fencing may be produced here, and then, having generated the evil, Rome's theologians will justify their morality by its existence. How thankful ought we not to be at the prospect of first being reduced from robust health to the diseased state of Naples and Spain, and then of being supplied with a cup of Liguori's mixture to make us better! By a new application of the Homœopathic system, immorality must be called in to cure the vice which it will itself have caused.

But to return to our text-book. At least it will be thought that sufficient care has been taken for allowing men to lie with a safe conscience, and to break faith without any troublesome scruples, by means of the Equivocations, Mental Restrictions, Conditions, Distinctions, Probable Opinions, and other scaffolding, which we have seen provided for them. But this is only the beginning. There may be tender consciences, over which the force of truth may yet hold some sway, and still further provision must be made for their necessities. Accordingly there remain Dispensations, Irritations, Commutations, Relaxations, Cessations, and Remissions. Now, at least, we are safe—now we are quite secure against having to keep our promises, to perform our vows, or to fulfil our oaths.

'In how many ways can the obligation of a vow be removed? In two ways:—1. Without the intervention of any one's authority, and that either by the change of matter, (as if the matter had been before good and became

bad, or indifferent, or an obstacle to a greater good, owing to a new circumstance, or prohibition, or absolutely or morally impossible,) or by the cessation of the condition on which it depended. 2. By the intervention of human authority, and that in three ways, by Irritation, Commutation, and Dispensation. This is the common opinion. Hence you may conclude, that, although it is by your own fault that the matter has become impossible, useless, &c., yet, since it has become so, the obligation ceases, and it is enough to be sorry for your fault.'—4. 3. 225.

'Dispensation is the absolute doing away with the obligation of a vow, and is made in the name of God. Good reason is required for its validity, such as,—1. The good of the Church, or the common welfare of the republic, and even of a family, or the greater advantage of the man who has vowed. 2. A notable difficulty in observing the vow. 3. Imperfection of act, or levity, or easiness from which the vow proceeded.'—4. 3. 250.

'A sufficient cause for dispensation is danger of transgression on account of the particular indisposition of the person who has made the vow, or on account of the common frailty of man. Great difficulty in the execution is also a sufficient reason, not only if the difficulty was unforeseen, as Sanchez, Palao, and Suarez say, but also if it was foreseen, as the Salamanca doctors think with Leander and Tamburini.... It is a sufficient reason, too, if the man under the vow is troubled with great scruples. Besides, even if there is no danger of transgression, and no great difficulty in the execution, still it is a sufficient reason if the vow was made immaturely, with too great facility, with imperfect consideration, or without perfect liberty.'—4. 2. 252.

'Those who can dispense are the following:—1. The Pope, with respect to all the faithful. 2. A Bishop, with respect to those under him, but not a parish priest. 3. Regular Prelates, who are exempt, in respect to their monks and novices.... By privilege from the Pope, the confessors of the Mendicant Orders, subject to the permission and regulation of their superior.'—4. 2. 256.

'A Prelate seeing, and not contradicting when he easily can, seems to give a dispensation, says Sa.'—4. 2. 254.

'How can the obligation of oaths be taken away by means of irritation, dispensation, commutation, or remission?... If an oath cannot be kept without common damage, or be about a contract forbidden by law, in truth such oaths do not require relaxation, as they are null in themselves. But suppose they *are* valid, they can be relaxed by the Church, and under the name of the Church come not only the Pontiff, but also Bishops, Chapters while Sees are vacant, and others with Episcopal jurisdiction, and also confessors with a delegated faculty of dispensing in vows, for they can also relax oaths of this kind.'—4. 2. 192.

Illustrations always make us realize abstract propositions in a way which we otherwise find difficult. We will, therefore, take a supposed case, and see how these principles would work. Let us suppose that some hundred gentlemen have been admitted to certain privileges on the condition of binding themselves by oath to act in a particular way in connexion with a certain subject. Let us further suppose, by way of clearness, that such privileges were, sitting and legislating in the Houses of Parliament, and that the condition which they have sworn to observe was, that they should do nothing to the detriment of the Established Church of England and Ireland. Having pic-

tured such a case to ourselves, let us also suppose the same gentlemen, who have taken this imaginary oath, to be zealous and earnest persecutors of the said Established Church in parliament and out of parliament; let us suppose them to be straining every nerve for its overthrow and utter destruction. Let us go so far as to conceive by a stretch of imagination that such language as the following might be found in their mouths:—'Enormous abuse,'—'Incubus on the country,'—'Hideous injustice,'—'The levelling of which will alone give peace to Ireland,'—and other phrases of a similar nature. Having made these imaginary suppositions, let us further suppose that these gentlemen were called upon before the bar of their own consciences, or the outraged public opinion of their fellow-countrymen, to justify their actions and their words, and to show how they were in accordance with the solemn oaths which they had sworn. Would S. Alfonso de' Liguori's principles of Morality, sanctioned as they are in the fullest manner by an authority invested with the halo of infallibility, in which these gentlemen are bound to believe,—would the principles which we have been drawing out be such as they might shelter themselves under in their hour of trial? Let us draw up the curtain, and we may have the following scene:—

Judge, loquitur.—'Gentlemen, you are charged with a want of good faith, and you must sit down under this imputation, unless you can free yourselves from it by appealing to the rules laid down in S. Alfonso's "Moral Theology," which I am bound to hold sacred and sufficient to justify you, provided you can show that your conduct has been in accordance with them.'

Culprit 1.—'I used a word which would bear two meanings.' Acquitted.—4. 151.

Culprit 2.—'I used a sentence which would bear two meanings.' Acquitted.—4. 151.

Culprit 3.—'In replying to the question put to me, I used the formula, *I say, No*, and confirmed it with an oath, meaning that I swore that I was making use of the word *No*.' Acquitted.—4. 151.

Culprit 4.—'I used non-pure mental restriction.'—*Judge.* 'Are you sure that it was not pure mental restriction, which is a thing not allowable?' 'Quite. Indeed, my well-known abhorrence of the Establishment would in itself be a sufficient circumstance from which a prudent man might gather that I did not intend what I swore, (4. 643;) but, to make sure, I whispered something which no one overheard so as to understand.' (4. 168.) Acquitted.—4. 151.

Culprit 5.—'I took no oath at all: I only swore externally, and therefore I took no oath, I joked. 'Η γλῶσσ' ὀμώμοχ', ἡ δὲ φρὴν ἀνώμοτος.' Acquitted.—4. 171.

Culprit 6.—'I took no oath: I only said *I swear*, and this was no oath because no question preceded it.' Acquitted.—4. 166.

Culprit 7.—'I took no oath: I only said, *I declare with an oath*, and that is no oath, for the same reason.' Acquitted.—4. 166.

Culprit 8.—'I took no oath: for from common usage the material

writing or speaking does not seem to be counted a true oath.' Acquitted.—4. 166.

Culprit 9.—'I did swear, though falsely: but I had a good reason for it, lest I, a worthy person, should be rejected.' Acquitted.—4. 166.

Culprit 10.—'I swore without the intention of swearing, and that is only a venial sin.' Acquitted.—4. 172.

Culprit 11.—'I swore intending to swear, but not intending to bind myself, and that is only a venial sin.' Acquitted.—4. 172.

Culprit 12.—'I conscientiously object to the oath, and therefore am under no obligation from it. An oath cannot be the bond of iniquity.' Acquitted.—4. 176.

Culprit 13.—'I consider it a useless oath, and therefore I am under no obligation from it. An oath cannot be a bond of vain and idle things to which God does not wish us to be bound.' Acquitted.—4. 176.

Culprit 14.—'I think it to be about an indifferent matter, and therefore I am not bound by it.' Acquitted.—4. 176.

Culprit 15.—'I am not bound by the oath, because the greater part of my colleagues do not act upon it.' Acquitted.—4. 180.

Culprit 16.—'I hold the oath to be obsolete, and therefore am free from the obligation of observing it.' Acquitted.—4. 180.

Culprit 17.—'I considered the object to which I swore good at the time, but now I think that circumstances have made it unlawful.' Acquitted.—4. 187.

Culprit 18.—'I considered the object to which I swore good at the time, but I think that it has now become idle.' Acquitted.—4. 187.

Culprit 19.—'I think that it has become a hindrance to a greater good.' Acquitted.—4. 187.

Culprit 20.—'I consider that it is better that it should be omitted than fulfilled.' Acquitted.—4. 187.

Culprit 21.—'I swore, but I have changed my oath into a work clearly better and more pleasing to God.'—*Judge.* 'But had you not sworn something to the good of others? God does not wish man defrauded.'—*Culprit.* 'No, it was to the harm of others, not their good.' Acquitted.—4. 187.

Culprit 22.—'I swore, but the state of the case has become notably changed, and therefore I am not bound to keep my oath.' Acquitted.—4. 187.

Culprit 23.—'The end proposed by the oath was doubtless the advantage of religion and of the commonwealth; now I think that the observance of the oath has become useless for this end, and therefore I am not bound by it.' Acquitted.—4. 187.

Culprit 24.—'I took the oath, but I can't keep it.' Acquitted.—4. 187.

Culprit 25.—'Nature and the Doctors teach that every oath is taken under this condition, "Saving the rights of my Superior." The Pope being my Superior, I am bound to save his rights, and so far as the oath interferes with his rights it must give way.' Acquitted.—4. 187.

Culprit 26.—'I should lose my character in Ireland if I kept it.' Acquitted.—4. 187.

Culprit 27.—'I should lose my seat, and that would be grave damage Acquitted.—4, 187.

Culprit 28.—'The oath was in illicit matter, and therefore, *ipso fac* null.' Acquitted.—4. 644.

Culprit 29.—'The oath cannot be kept without common detrimer Acquitted.—4. 192.

Culprit 30.—'I have received a dispensation.'—*Judge.* 'On what grov was the dispensation granted?'—*Culprit.* 'On the grounds that the

of the Church, and consequently of the commonwealth, was against my keeping the oath.' Acquitted.—4. 192.

Who shall bind Proteus? Who shall tie to truth and fair dealing men who can have recourse to Rome's casuistry as often as their consciences become uneasy?

But, for purposes of illustration, we need not have recourse to cases which may be considered imaginary. The 'Treatise of Equivocation,' which we have placed at the head of our article, supplies us with the same principles; and the events connected with it tell us how those principles were applied by their authors and defenders. This treatise, published from a MS. in the Bodleian two years ago, has scarcely attracted so much attention as it deserves, regarded as a literary and historical document, apart from its controversial bearings. It was well known that such a treatise had existed, and that it was the authorized manual, employed, not without provocation, by the missionary priests and others in England, during the latter part of the reign of Elizabeth. It had been produced by Sir Edward Coke, in the trial of Garnet and the other conspirators in 1604. 'And here,' says the authorized 'Report of the Proceedings,' 'was shown a book, written not long before the queen's 'death, at what time Thomas Winter was employed into Spain, 'entitled *A Treatise of Equivocation*, which book being seen and 'allowed by Garnet, the superior of the Jesuits, and Blackwell, 'the arch-priest of England, in the beginning thereof Garnet 'with his own hand put out these words in the title, *of Equivo-'cation*, and made it thus, *A Treatise against Lying and Fraudu-'lent Dissimulation*, whereas, in deed and truth, it makes for 'both; *Speciosaque nomina culpæ Imponis Garnette tuæ*. And 'in the end thereof Blackwell besprinkles it with his blessing, 'saying, "Tractatus iste valde doctus et vere pius et Catholicus 'est. Certe S. Scripturarum, Patrum, Doctorum, Scholasti-'corum, Canonistarum, et optimarum rationum præsidiis planis-'simè firmat æquitatem æquivocationis. Ideoque dignissimus 'est qui typis propagetur ad consolationem afflictorum Catholi-'corum et omnium piorum instructionem."' Morton, Bishop of Durham, wrote a systematic reply to it in 1606, in his *Full Satisfaction*. Dr. Robert Abbott, in his *Antilogia*, in 1613, and Henry Mason, in his *New Art of Lying*, in 1624, discussed its principles. Parsons, in his *Treatise tending to Mitigation*, in 1607, spoke of it as 'a certain Catholicke manuscript treatise, made in defence of Equivocation, and intercepted by them:' and Casaubon gave an account of it in his *Letter to Fronto Ducæus*. But where was the Treatise itself, which had once made such a stir in the world? Nobody knew, and it was generally

supposed to be lost. A hue and cry was raised for it by an anonymous inquirer in *Notes and Queries;* and, near the end of the year 1850, it was found in the Bodleian Library among the Laudian Miscellaneous MSS. The way in which it got there is curious. The occasion on which it was first made *publici juris* is thus recorded by Sir Edward Coke, in a manuscript note on the first leaf of the Treatise. 'This book, containing sixty-one 'pages, I found in a chamber in the Inner Temple, wherein Sir 'Thomas Tresham used to lie, and which he obtained for his 'two younger sons. This 5. of December, 1605. Edw. Coke. '*Os quod mentitur occidit animam.*' After having been produced at the trial, as mentioned above, it was laid up in the State Paper Office. In 1612, it was borrowed from thence by Archbishop Abbott, and lent by him to his brother, the Regius Professor of Divinity in Oxford, who was at that time composing his *Antilogia versus Apologiam Andreæ Endæmon-Joannis pro Henrico Garneto.* A memorandum of the State Paper Office, which has been accidentally preserved, notices that the Archbishop, in restoring the other papers which had been delivered to him, had omitted to send back the Treatise. Thus it came into Laud's possession, when he succeeded Abbott at Lambeth, and was by him given with other papers to the Bodleian Library.

The author of the work is unknown. Abbott, in the polite language of the controversy of his day, styled him quietly, 'Sacerdos quidam Sathanæ.' Casaubon says that it was written 'ab eruditis Pontificiis in hoc regno.' It is corrected for the press by Garnet, approved by Blackwell, and defended by its apologists, not on the plea of the exigency of the times,—this is very noticeable,—not on the plea of the exigency of the times, but on account of the righteous nature of the doctrine which it propounds.

The object of the book is twofold: first, to justify Southwell in having instructed a witness that she might conscientiously affirm on oath, in a court of justice, that she had not seen him in Bellamy's house, although she had been in the constant habit of meeting him there, provided that, at the time of taking the oath *I have not seen him*, she said to herself, *so as to tell you of it;* and secondly, to provide an authorized system for evading the truth, without being guilty of what the Church of Rome considers to be a lie.

The first chapter lays down the principle, that an oath ought to fulfil three conditions to be a lawful oath: it must be sworn in truth, in justice, and judgment.[1] The premise seems far enough away from the conclusion which is to be reached; but the

[1] Jer. iv. 2.

space is very quickly bridged over. It is clear that, if an assertion is true, the same assertion confirmed by an oath is likewise true: if, therefore, there is no deficiency of truth in the assertion, *I have not seen him*, with the aside, *so as to tell you*, when nevertheless I have seen him,—in that case, the oath confirming that assertion is not wanting in truth. The point, of course, is to prove that such an *assertion* is truthful. For this end propositions are divided into four kinds:—

'The first is a mental proposition, only conceived in the mynde, and not uttered by any external signification. . . The second is a vocal proposition, as when I utter these words with my mouth. The third is a written proposition, as if I should set down the same in wryting. The last of all is a mixt proposition, when we mingle some of these propositions, or parts of them, together; as in our purpose when, being demanded whether John at Style be in such place, I, knowing that he is there indeed, do say nevertheless, "I know not," reserving or understanding within myself these other words, "to the end for to tell you." Here is a mixt proposition containing all this—"I know not to the end for to tell you." And yet part of it is expressed, part reserved in the mynde. Now, unto all these propositions it is common that then they are trewe when they are conformable to the thing itself; that is, when they so affirm or deny as the matter itself in very deed doth stand. Whereof we inferre that this last sort of proposition, which partly consisteth in voyce, and partly is reserved in the mynde, is then to be adjudged trewe, not when that part only which is expressed, or the other only which is reserved, is trewe, but when both together do contain a truth.'—P. 8.

We will not pause to point out the puerile confusion here exhibited between material truth and moral truthfulness. Our object is rather to show the contents of the book, than to undertake so superfluous a task as that of refuting it. The third chapter consists of a 'metaphysical consideration,' proving that such mixed propositions are true propositions, and that 'their 'veritye is not to be judged according to that which is uttered 'in words severally, but according to the words and some other 'thing understood or reserved.' The fourth is an appeal to authority. David used mixed propositions; for he said that the wicked should not rise again in the judgment, which is 'a false and heretical proposition,' unless he reserved something in his mind. Our Saviour used them; for He said that whatsoever He had heard from his Father, He had made known to His disciples; and that whatsoever two faithful persons should ask, it should be done; and that He was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel; and that Jaïrus' daughter was not dead, but asleep; and that His disciples could not go where He was going; and that the Son knew not the day of judgment; and that He was not going up to the feast. S. Paul used them; for he said that no man had seen or could see God; and yet 'Moses, as most holy fathers do affirme, and our blessed Ladye,

'as most schoolmen hold, and S. Paul hymself before that time, 'saw the very essence of God.'

This is quite enough for the first purpose which the Treatise was to serve; and so, in the three last chapters, we are brought triumphantly to the conclusion, that such an oath as that which Southwell taught Miss Bellamy to take, is wanting neither in truth, nor in justice, nor in judgment. It is not wanting in truth; for 'an oath of an equivocal proposition is a trewe oath, 'because of the truth of the proposition alone—because of the 'doctrine of the fathers—because it skylleth not that the pro-'position is conceived as false—because in every oath there is 'understood this condition, that I will do so far as it is lawful—'and because, in not meaning to perform the oath in the imme-'diate sense of the judge, I have no contrary meaning to the 'principal meaning and intention which he hath, *or should have.*' It is not wanting in justice; for 'when the partye which is ex-'amined is asked that particular question, *Was he there?* what 'hyndereth that he may not say *No?* Not his oath; for that 'falleth not upon that question, being an unlawful question. 'Then it is only the lye; and being hurtful to nobodye, the 'most that these canonistes can make of it is but an officious 'lye, which is but a small veniall synne, and rather to be in-'curred than the other, of prejudicing so highly our neighbour. 'And yet, if he did equivocate, meaning *No, to tell you*, then 'was it no lye at all, and it was but an equivocation not sworn; 'for the oath, as I said, did not nor could fall upon that question: 'so that it is an equivocation very far from perjury.' It is not wanting in judgment,—that is, it may be taken without rash-ness or indiscretion; for 'so long as there is, in the sense of that which I swear, veritye and justice,'—which has just been proved,—'I may without all rashness swear in this manner, so 'ofte as, having the fear of God before my eyes, I probably 'repute that either my own just profitt, or of my neighbour, or 'the honour of God, doth so require.' The conclusion is as follows:—

'So that all allow this speech, *I will answere whatsoever I knowe*, meaning, *for to tell you.* If they will not admit that limitation, then, according to Bannez, they are bound to understand it, notwithstanding, in all his answeres. But, for further direction of the partye examined, if the oath be ministered generally, let hym admit the oath with this intention, that he will answere directly and truly, and (if so they urge hym) without all equivo-cation, so far as he is assured, without all doubt or scruple that he may or is bound. And if they make hym swear that he hath no private intention, or secret meaning, let hym swear it also with that very same secret under-standing, that he hath no such meaning—to tell them. And with this general meaning at the beginning, when he took the oath, let hym not doubt but he shall be safe from all perjury, although he answer truly to nothing, because in these cases he is bound to answer directly to nothing. Yet, for

to save hymself from lying, (which, notwithstanding, were but a very veniall synne in these matters, and of far less account than, perhaps, many other synnes which he hourly committeth,) let hym use some reasonable kynds of equivocation, as he may easily learn, of the wiser sort; that is, let hym speake some words which may satisfye the hearers, and, with some other words which he conceiveth, may make a trewe sense. And let hym assure hymself, that by no way he can sinne more heinously in these matters than to disclose that which is indeed, whether he have sworn it or no. But if he had no intention of equivocation, at the first when he took the oath, yet let hym persuade hymself, nevertheless, that he is not bound by his oath to do anything which becometh not an honest man; and so, if he equivocate in the particular question, he synneth not at all. If he tell plain lyes, without any true sense reserved, those do not so much offend God with their falsitye, as He is wont to reward such fidelitye, as we read in the midwives of Egypt, and in that honest harlot, if so we may call her, Rahab, to whom God hymself showed special favours. Fynally, if he be urged to swear the truth of some particular matter, let hym intend to tell the truth—so far as he is bound. If *to do* any particular unlawful matter, if it be such a thing as may be well interpreted, and not to tend to any scandal or dishonour of God, let hym swear it with equivocation, but not meaning to do it. If it be scandalous, or manifestly contrary to Christian duty, he must needs refuse it, as hath been declared before.'—P. 103.

Thus Southwell's good faith is vindicated, as well as 'the 'practice which was common in all Christian courts, and in all 'politicke governments, before these accusers or their great-'grandfather Luther was born, when the world was governed 'with as great piety, justice, and learning, as these scrupulous 'persons will ever establish in this realm, though they use never 'so great diligence.' The Treatise would not, however, be complete in its character of a manual, if it contained no more than this. There are other ways, besides this method of mental restriction, (here called equivocation,) 'whereby, without a lye, a trewth may be covered;' and these must be enumerated. The first of these answers to Liguori's first form of Amphibology, 'where a word hath many significations, and we understand it 'in one sense which is trewe, although the hearer conceive the 'other which is false. . . . . The like whereunto were, if one 'should be asked whether such a stranger lodgeth in my house, 'and I should answer, "He lyeth not at my house," meaning 'that he doth not tell a lye there, although he lodge there.'[1] To the second we have no objection to make, if it is used discreetly, 'when unto one question may be given many answers; we may yeelde one, and conceale the other.' The third corresponds with Liguori's second form of Amphibology, where 'the 'whole sentence which we pronounce, or some word thereof, or 'the manner of poynting and dividing the sentences, may be

[1] P. 49. A similar case is given in p. 29. 'If I be asked whether such a one be in my house, who is there indeed, I may answer in Latin, *Non est hic*, meaning that he eateth not there, for so doth *est* signifye.'

'ambiguous, and we may speak it in one sense trewe for our 'advantage.' Thus, 'it was not reprehensible, in one which 'had just cause, to say his father's name was Peter or Paul, 'because the Apostles are the spiritual fathers of the worlde;' and, 'so if one should say to a theife, *Juro tibi numeraturum me* '200 *aureos*, the word *tibi* may be joyned with *juro*, or with '*numeraturum*. In like manner a man may cunningly alter 'the pronunciation, as if, according to the Italian manner of 'pronunciation, a man should say *tibi uro* for *tibi juro*, which 'two examples Bellarmine bringeth in his Dictates, 2. 2. q. 89. 'ar. 7. dub. 2., as also before (adds Garnet) q. 69. ar. 2. 'dub. 2.'

'To these three ways of concealing a trewth by words, if we add the other of which we spoke before,—that is, when we utter certain words which of themselves may engender a false conceit in the mynde of the hearers, and yet, with somewhat which we understand and reserve in our myndes, maketh a trewe proposition,[1]—then shall we have four ways how to conceal a trewth without making a lye.'—P. 52.

And what effect had these doctrines on the moral conduct of their promulgators and recipients? Take the case of Garnet himself. Casaubon recounts how he acted upon his principles at the time of his own trial. During his imprisonment, he had been in the constant habit of holding communication with Hall or Oldcorne, who was confined in an adjoining chamber. The words which passed between them were overheard, and many facts were in this method elicited. After a time, Garnet was charged before the Lords of the Council with having held these conferences. He put a bold face on the matter; and, although warned not to equivocate, denied it upon his soul, 'reiterating his denial,' as the Earl of Salisbury said, 'with so many detestable execrations, as it wounded the hearts of the Lords to hear.' It was told him that Oldcorne had confessed the fact, upon which the wretched man 'cried the Lords' pardon, and said he had offended, *if equivocation did not help him.*' Again, take the case of Francis Tresham, to whom this identical Treatise which is now in the Bodleian belonged. During his examination, he had admitted Garnet's complicity in the mission of Winter to Spain. A few hours before his death he wrote a paper, and signed it with his name, declaring that he had made his previous statement only to avoid ill-usage; and 'that, upon his salvation, it was more

[1] Other examples of this mental reservation, besides those already given, are the following:—'*Non feci*, I did not,' understanding '*ut dicam tibi*, that I may or ought to tell you;' or, 'I did it not, yesterday.' '*Non habeo*, I have it not,' understanding, 'for to give you.' '*Dabo*, I will give you an hundred pounds,' understanding, 'if I fynd it in Cheapside.' P. 31.

'than he knew that Garnet was privy to the sending of Thomas 'Winter into Spain;' and 'that he had not seen Garnet for six-'teen years before, nor never had letter nor message from him.' This was wholly false, as all but Liguorians and their predecessors count falsehood. Garnet acknowledged his constant intercourse with him; and on being asked by Lord Salisbury 'what interpretation he made of the testamental protestation of 'Tresham,' replied, 'It may be, my Lord, he meant to equivocate.' 'This,' says Sir Edward Coke, in a letter to Lord Salisbury, 'is the fruit of equivocation, the book whereof we 'found in Tresham's desk—to affirm manifest falsehoods upon 'his salvation, *in ipso articulo mortis.* It is true that no man 'may judge in this case, for *intra pontem et fontem*, he might 'find grace; but it is the most fearful example that I ever 'knew.'[1]

The exhumation of this Treatise gives an opportunity of examining an interesting question,—how far the Theory of Truthfulness, taught by Rome at the beginning of the seventeenth century, is the same as that which she teaches in the nineteenth. Our extracts from S. Alfonso de' Liguori will have shown that, in spirit, they are identically the same. In form they differ, but only to this extent. There is a greater boldness and shamelessness two centuries ago; a greater consciousness that all the world is not prepared to accept such principles in their nakedness now. There is a *naiveté* and a heartiness then, which is exchanged for doggedness of assertion now. But more than this. In the interval between the publication of the 'Treatise of Equivocation' and the 'Theologia Moralis,' there lived Innocent XI. Innocent XI. of the house of Odescalchi, was a Pope meek and mild in manner, but firm and high in purpose. In his opposition to Louis XIVth's encroachments on the spiritual power, he found himself fighting side by side with the Bishop of Pamiers and others of the Jansenist party. A man of uncompromising and inflexible integrity in his private life, he naturally leant towards the Jansenist codes of morality, and had little sympathy with the system which, twenty years before he had been raised to the pontificate, Pascal had held up to scorn and indignation. Accordingly he made short work with many a darling proposition, which had been enshrined in such books as are represented by Herman Busembaum's *Marrow of Moral Theology*, and other works of 'the Society.' Regardless of the long line of logical argument on which they rested, regardless of the ingenuity and authority of their supporters, Innocent acted

[1] State Paper Office, Criminal Trials, vol. ii. p. 102. Quoted in preface to 'Treatise of Equivocation.'

on the instincts of a human heart, and unsparingly condemned propositions as soon as they touched upon practice, without venturing—or deigning—to grapple with the subtle train of dialectic on which they were speculatively founded. Accordingly, on the subject of Mental Reservation, we find the three following propositions 'condemned by Innocent XI.:'—

'I. If anyone, either alone or in the presence of others, either asked or of his free will, either for amusement or for any other reason, swears that he has not done something which he really has done, meaning in his own mind something else which he did not do, or another way from that in which it was done, or any other added circumstance which is true, he in fact tells no lie, and is not perjured.

'II. There is good reason for a man's using these amphibologies, as often as it is necessary or useful, to protect himself, or his honour, or his property, or in order to perform any kind of virtuous act, so that the concealment of the truth is then counted expedient and desirable.

'III. Whoever has been promoted to a magistracy or public office by means of a recommendation, or by bribery, may take the oath required by the king's mandate, with mental restriction, without respecting the intention with which it is exacted, because he is not bound to confess a hidden crime.'[1]

It must have been a hard thing for the under-workers to bear, when the master-builder came in and struck down the crowning-stone, for the support of which they had erected their work. However, *ingenium res adversæ nudare solent.* 'Il Papa biancho' is no match for 'Il Papa nero;' and Jansenism has always been worsted in its conflicts with Jesuitism. The Moral-Theologians set to work, and it soon appeared that Innocent XI. might have spared his pains: he only gave one triumph more to casuistical ingenuity.

Given the problem, how to retain a certain practice, and at the same time to pay outward respect to a Papal decree forbidding it, the method to be adopted is the following:—Take the thing condemned, and divide it into two species, distinguished from each other by a distinction without a difference: assume that the Papal condemnation applies to either one of these species, but not to the other: range everything which you wish to do under the uncondemned head, whatever you have no temptation towards under the other: the result will be the conclusion desired. Thus, the Pope condemned Mental Restriction: immediately Mental Restriction is divided into two kinds,—Pure Mental Restriction, and Non-pure Mental Restriction. There is no moral difference between them; but the Papal condemnation is declared to be confined to the former, and so the old practice goes on as securely and merrily as ever. Morally speaking, the present system, dogmatically enunciated, differs

[1] Quoted in Theol. Mor. 4. 152.

in no essential point from that of Garnet, Tresham, and Blackwell.[1]

Very different is the doctrine of S. Augustine, to whose authority, as well as to the example of our Lord, we have seen that S. Alfonso had the hardihood to appeal. We will now offer our readers a specimen of the teaching of the great Doctor of Hippo on this point. It may be that Liguori will have done his cause little good by appealing to the uncompromising Moralist of the Early Church. He may, perhaps, serve to point out that Rome admits of development in morals as well as in doctrine: that as what was once rejected as false is accepted as true after the decree of a Pope; so what was rejected as immorality by S. Augustine has been made moral by the decision of the casuists. 'How do 'you manage,' asks Pascal, 'when the Fathers of the Church 'happen to differ from any of your casuists?' 'The Fathers,' is the reply, 'were good enough for the morality of their own 'times, but they lived too far back for that of the present age, 'which is no longer regulated by them but by the modern 'casuists. . . . . At their advent S. Augustine, S. Chrysostom, 'S. Ambrose, S. Jerome, and all the rest, so far as morals are 'concerned, disappeared from the stage.'

The treatise of S. Augustine, to which reference was made is that which he wrote against Lying. We will now shortly draw out the principles there laid down. We shall feel like a man who has left behind him the fogs and malaria of a reeking morass, and risen to the healthy atmosphere of mountain scenery. S. Augustine has written two books on the subject of Lying, and has many passages on the same subject interspersed amidst his voluminous writings. It is observable that he no-

[1] This general method of dealing with condemnations is well illustrated in the case of clerical hunting. The steps are as follows:—'1. Clerical hunting is forbidden in general terms. 2. The Doctors understand in common, that this prohibition applies only to clamorous hunting, which takes place with a noise. 3. Neither does it apply to all clamorous hunting with a noise, but only to frequent clamorous hunting with a noise. 4. Neither does it apply to all frequent clamorous hunting with a noise, but only to frequent clamorous hunting with a noise, which is scandalous or very expensive. 5. Sporer, Molina, Cajetan, and Sa, say that merely for hunting, without any adjunct, a clergyman is not easily to be condemned of mortal sin. 6. Layman, Lessius, Sa, Valentia, &c. think that such hunting may be altogether blameless, if it is rare and moderate, or from necessity or for exercise. 7. A modern author, who has written a book called "Instructions for New Confessors," says that non-clamorous hunting for the sake of honest recreation is perfectly allowable, and that, canonically, clamorous hunting is not, according to the more common opinion, a mortal sin, except with the adjuncts of contempt or contumacy. Monks are forbidden clamorous hunting more strictly. They are only allowed, without grave sin, to go out two or three times a-year, in case they can do so without giving scandal, or making a great noise.' (Theol. Mor. 4. 606. Hom. Ap. 10. 72.)

where makes a distinction between lying and equivocating. Equivocating is in his estimation lying, and the same definition includes Amphibology and Mendacity. 'The double heart' is, according to his teaching, the source of the accursed thing, and any man 'who has one thing in his mind, and enunciates another by words or any sorts of signs,' is guilty of the sin. Word-jugglery is a thing unknown to him, for the sage of Hippo was too wise to be deceived himself, and too honest to deceive others by such a transparent fallacy as that which lies at the bottom of the justification of equivocation. What is the use of a word? To represent to others a conception existing in our mind. If, then, the word which we use represents to the person to whom we speak, not the conception which we have in our mind, but something else, the assertion involved in the proposition containing that word is really two assertions. Thus, in the case given above, 'the heir (air) was present,' is of course two assertions, one materially true, the other materially false: again, the proposition, 'The moon is light,' contains two assertions, one materially true, viz. 'the moon is not obscured,' the other materially false, viz. 'the moon is deficient in weight,' and so every proposition with an ambiguous word contains really two assertions. Now the fact of these assertions being *materially* both true, or both false, or, as is generally the case, one true and the other false, is not of the slightest value with regard to the moral act of the person speaking. If we persist in making use of a proposition thus containing two assertions, one of which is true, viz. that which the words signify according to our acceptation, and the other false, viz. that which we know the words signify in our neighbour's acceptation, we are simply and absolutely guilty of moral falsehood. It is not to be wondered at, then, that in S. Augustine's writings no distinction is drawn between equivocating and lying, because equivocating and lying are morally identical.

The following passage will show how clearly his philosophic mind saw that moral truthfulness in the speaker did not depend upon the material truth or falsehood of the thing spoken. It is not directly upon equivocation, but upon a kindred kind of lying:—

'A man is deceived when he thinks what he says to be true, and it is really false: a man lies, when he thinks something to be false and says it as though true, *whether it be really true or false.* Mark the addition which I have made. Whether it be really true or false, yet, if a man thinks it false and asserts it as true, he lies, *for he is aiming to deceive.* What good is it to him, that it is true? He thinks it false, and says it as though it were true. True it is *in itself,* what he says, *in itself* it is true: *to him* it is false. What he is conscious of and what he speaks are not the same: he thinks within himself that one thing is true, and utters another as thou

it were true. *His heart is double, not single, he does not bring out what he has there.* The double heart has long since been reproved, "Deceitful lips .... dissemble in their double heart." Ps. xii. 2. What is deceit? When one thing is pretended and another done. Deceitful lips are when the heart is not single.'—*Serm.* 133, vol. v. p. 739.

In his books *De Mendacio* and *Contra Mendacium*, S. Augustine enumerates eight sorts of lying. Every one he rejects uncompromisingly. He denies that we may at any time be guilty of moral falsehood under whatever temptation we may be. The sin of the tongue in violating veracity is as great, he says, as the sin of the hand in theft or in murder, or, at least, we are no more justified in committing the former than the latter. He discusses all the examples of apparent falsehood in the Old and New Testaments, to which those who had a theory of lying appealed in his days as they do now, and concludes that 'for 'the examples which are brought forward out of the Holy 'Scriptures, either they are not falsehoods, but are supposed to 'be such by not being understood; or, if they are falsehoods, 'they are not proposed as objects of imitation.' He does not shrink from meeting difficult cases. He puts the very same case which we have before had with respect to S. Francis of Assisi. The bright thought of pointing down his sleeve had not, however, then arisen, and not even S. Augustine's sagacity could suggest it. Leaving that ingenious device to be recommended by saints of a more modern date, he solves the question in this fashion. Suppose that a man flies to a spot for refuge, and you see where he conceals himself; you are questioned about him: are you to lie? Your answer should be, 'I will not betray, and I will not lie.' But the question may be put in such a form that mere silence, or saying that you would not tell, might betray him, and you could avert his danger by a falsehood. Your answer should be, 'I know where he is, but I will never show the place;' for if you refuse to answer whether or no he is in a certain place, you will rouse certain suspicion with respect to that place; but by prefacing your answer by a confession of your knowledge of his whereabouts, you may turn away the attention of the inquirer from any particular spot, and make him press you to discover the object of his search; and if for your fidelity and humanity you have to endure suffering, your conduct will be not only free from blame but praiseworthy. This is the substance of his solution of the difficulty.[1]

Now we can perfectly conceive the possibility of a case arising in which the two virtues of veracity and charity might so clash as to make it, at least, pardonable to deflect somewhat

[1] De Mendacio, cap. 13.

from the rigid observance of the former. S. Augustine does not admit such a possibility. 'You must not destroy your own soul,' he replies, 'for any supposed good of your neighbour, spiritual or temporal.' And yet it is to S. Augustine that Liguori refers in justification of his Equivocation and non-pure Mental Reservation, which, according to S. Augustine's definition, are merely forms of expressing a Lie.

In the same spirit S. Augustine is quoted in the Breviary as addressing the Blessed Virgin with the title of 'The only Hope of Sinners,' although the Sermon in which such words occur is known by every one of moderate attainments to be spurious, and is excluded from S. Augustine's works by the Benedictine editors. The value of truth, for truth's sake, is a thing apparently unappreciated and inappreciable by the Romish theological mind, in so far as it is Romish or distinct from Catholic. In one passage in this very treatise S. Augustine seems to have had before his eyes, by a prescient anticipation, the race of Salamanca doctors, Bonacinas, Escobars, and Liguoris. 'And there are among them learned men,' he cries, 'who actually lay down rules and fix limits when a man ought, 'and when he ought not, to commit perjury! O fountains of 'tears, where are ye? Where shall we go? Where shall we hide 'ourselves from the wrath of Truth, if we not only do not guard 'against lies, but dare over and above to teach perjury?' And here is a warning which may not be amiss at present in England.

'This, again, is a most miserable thing: even those who are just become our converts don't know how to believe us; for, on their suspecting that we are lying to them about the Catholic dogmas too, so as to be concealing something or other which we think true, you would be sure to say, "I acted in that way, then, in order to catch you;" but what will you answer when the other says, "And how am I to tell that you are not doing the same now in order not to be caught by me?" Will any one be persuaded that a man who will lie in order to catch another, will not lie in order not to be caught himself? See you not the tendency of this pestilential thing? It tends to make every one a justifiable object of supicion to every one else, us to them, they to us, brother to brother. And so while the Faith is taught by falsehood, the result is rather that we have no faith in any one.'—*Cont. Mend.* cap. 4.

In short, we are reduced to that pleasant state of war and fencing on the plea of which Rome defends her Equivocation and non-pure Mental Reservation.

Thus we see that there is some difference between the *Theory of Truthfulness* held by Modern Rome and that held by the Ancient Church. We must now compare the teaching of England's Moral Theologians on the same point. Bishop Sanderson, whose works we are glad to learn are about to be reissued from th

University Press, has left behind him Lectures delivered in Oxford on the Obligation of Conscience, and on the Obligation of Oaths. We will make a few extracts from the latter of these works, in order to show the difference in principle between the teaching of a manly straightforward English mind, nurtured in the University of Oxford, in the bosom of England's Church, and that of a warped, however devout, Italian conscience, such as Liguori's, whom Rome has honoured with her beatification and canonization.

'An oath,' says Bishop Sanderson, 'is a religious act in 'which God is called to witness for the confirmation of some 'matter in doubt.' The main division of oaths is into assertory and promissory; the first having respect to what is present or past, the second to what is future. We take our extracts from an old translation of the year 1655, which professes to have been made by the special command of the late King Charles I. and revised by the royal hand.

'Whosoever sweareth, obligeth himself *ipso facto*, to manifest truth in that which he is about to say, whether it be in a matter past or present, by an assertory, or, in a future matter, by a promissory oath. And hitherto this obligation is alike common to both kinds, so that if in either of them the words of the party swearing do not agree with his mind, he becometh guilty of the breach of his duty, and thence also, by a necessary consequence, obnoxious unto punishment. But in the promissory oath, besides this obligation, which falls upon the conscience of the party swearing, and is common to it and the assertory *quatenus juramentum*, there is another further obligation proper and peculiar to it, *quatenus promissorium*, which falls upon the matter of the oath; by virtue whereof the promissory party swearing is bound not only in present to intend to do that which he sweareth, *that his words may agree with his mind*, but also to endeavour, for the future, as much as in him lieth, to fulfil that which he hath sworn, *that his deeds may agree with his words*; that is, he obligeth himself not only barely to promise that which he really intendeth, but also further obligeth himself to perform all that which he hath promised by oath.'—P. 30.

Again:—

'Whosoever bindeth himself to the performance of anything by so sacred a bond, is wholly bound by the religion of his oath, both in his mind seriously to intend, and as far as lieth in his power willingly to endeavour that he may faithfully perform whatsoever he hath promised, *without fraud, double-dealing, or simulation*. . . . As to the guilt of perjury, especially at the bar of conscience, it matters not much which way an oath be broken, openly or covertly, *that* being a symptom of a profane, *this*, of a deceitful heart; both which, *except fraud be worthy of a greater hatred*, are equally abominable unto the most holy God, who loveth the single in heart and truth in the inward man. . . . Men rest secure, absolving themselves from all guilt and fear of perjury, and think they have excellently well provided for themselves and their consciences, if, during the act of swearing, they can make any shift to defend themselves, either, as the Jesuits do, with some equivocation or mental reservation, or by forcing upon the words some subtle and unnatural interpretation; or if, after they have sworn, they can find some loophole or artificial evasion, whereby such art may be used with the oath that,

the words remaining, the sense may be eluded with some sophism, and the strength utterly lost. The ancient Christians did not acknowledge this kind of theology, nor the sounder heathens this moral philosophy. Far otherwise Augustine said, "They are perjured who, preserving the words, deceive the expectation of those to whom they have sworn."'—Pp. 37, 40.

Further:—

'Be it so, that a form of speech appears not by the words themselves, nor by the common estimation of men to be an oath; nevertheless, if a man using such a form, either through mistake think himself to have sworn or *through some deceitful intention would be thought to have sworn*, that form, though it be not really and in itself an oath, will have nevertheless, as to that man, the full obligations of an oath to all effects; and if he violate his faith so given, he is guilty at the bar of conscience, not only of falsehood, but of perjury. . . . Deceitfulness in the will doth not excuse from obligations, because it is most just that an impious and fraudulent man should fall into the pit which he digged for his neighbour, and that his feet should be caught in the snare which he set for another.'—P. 176.

These extracts will show the spirit of Bishop Sanderson's Treatise on Oaths.

We will now request our readers to recal to mind Liguori's doctrine of Amphibology. There are three kinds of equivocation, it will be remembered; equivocation by means of an ambiguous word—equivocation by means of a double-edged sentence—equivocation by means of such a phrase as *I say, No.* All these kinds of equivocation are justifiable and right when employed for a good reason, and all of them may be used with the sanction of an oath. Now let us compare the Bishop of the English Church with Rome's Bishop:—

'The second case is of an oath when the words, according to their common signification, are clear enough, but the party swearing, having no will to bind himself in that sense, intendeth another, whereof the words by reason of some ambiguity are not altogether incapable, and industriously concealeth his meaning in such sort as that the auditors understand one thing, he another. This is that *verbal equivocation* which, amongst some other casuists and scholastics, the Jesuits especially maintain and practise. . . . As if a Jesuit apprehended should swear that he was a *smith*, meaning that his name was *Smith*, or an apprentice, commanded to tell where his master is, should swear that he *died* a month ago, meaning that he then *dyed* stockings. . . . The Jesuits so vigorously defend this equivocation, that J. Molanus, Professor at Louvain, justifieth the murder of John Huss, perpetrated against the public faith engaged unto him for his safe-conduct, for this reason, that the conduct undertook for *his safe coming*, not for the safety of *his return*. And now let Jesuits confidently complain of the great injuries done them, whilst we say that they hold faith not to be kept with heretics; for if this be to keep faith, they need not much trouble themselves, with whomsoever it is contracted, whether it ought to be kept or broken. . . . *Our result is, that the party swearing after this manner both sinneth in his equivocal oath, and is, notwithstanding that tacit equivocation, bound in conscience unto the performance of his promise in that sense which the words yield of themselves, and are, without constraint, apt to beget upon the minds of others. Unless he act accordingly, he is not guiltless of perjury.*'—P. 192.

That he may not appear only to make assertions, or to declaim, he adds his reasons:—

'First, an oath, as we have laid down, ought to be most simply and effectually understood, unto which simplicity this artifice of industrious ambiguity is repugnant. 2. It is a great profanation of the name of God to invoke Him, as witness and searcher of hearts, to attest the truth of words which agree not with the heart of the party swearing; for what were this, if not, as far as lieth in man's power, to make God, who can neither deceive nor be deceived, an impostor and patron of base dissimulation? 3. Equivocation is contrary to the very institution and nature of an oath, whose chief use is to be *an end of strife and controversy*, and to give as certain security in uncertain things as human nature is able to afford, it being *expediendarum litium maximum remedium*. But that certainty which we seek in an oath is lost in equivocation, for what certainty can there be in his answer whose meaning is uncertainty? Nor are controversies thus ended, but aggravated. 4. The party so swearing deludeth his neighbour and knowingly deceiveth, contrary to the precept, *Ne jurat in dolo*, and to the ancient form, *Si sciens fallo*.'—P. 195.

Rome's canonized Bishop teaches, as we have seen, that non-pure mental reservation is allowable in assertions and in oaths. Contrast England's Bishop:—

'The third case allied to this is that of Mental Reservation, which the Jesuits defend with the same reasons, and define with the same qualifications, as verbal equivocation. For as, in that, by wresting the words pronounced into another sense, so, in this, by some addition not pronounced but conceived in the mind, the party swearing eludeth the interrogatory. So they say *a Priest*, if he be examined by an heretical magistrate whether he be *a Priest*, may answer that he is no *Priest*, meaning, *of Bacchus*, or *Apollo*. And an adulterous wife, if she be questioned of adultery by her jealous husband, may swear unto him that she committed not adultery; meaning, not to the end to tell him. The like they hold in promissory oaths; that a traveller, to save his life, may swear to give money to a thief, though he never intend it, provided that when he sware, "I will give thee so much," he understood, *if I owe it thee*, or *if thou demand it before the magistrate*. But as this mental reservation is built on the same sand with verbal equivocation, so is it destroyed at the same dash; for it rooteth all faith and assurance out of men, makes God an impostor, is deceitful unto our neighbour, perverteth the use and end of oaths, setteth open a great gate to all kinds of lies and perjuries, and is so much worse than equivocation as more difficult to be prevented. For equivocation foreseen or suspected may be prevented by such diligent explication of the words as may leave no loophole of ambiguity. But no human art or providence, if men will be juggling, can prevent this reservation. Jesuits and Priests, reserving unto themselves the liberty to reserve anything, are not afraid, with a serious brow, to take our oath of allegiance, though penned with such accuracy of words as leaveth no hold for cavil nor way of escape. Yet that very clause where, in express words, they promise that they will faithfully observe all that has gone before *according unto the tenour of the words pronounced by them, and according to the plain and natural sense and true intent of these words, without any equivocation or mental reservation whatsoever*, they understand at the same time with this reservation—*to wit, that I will tell you*.'—P. 198.

The two methods of dealing with a promissory oath made to a robber, are characteristic of the two theologians. 'You need

not pay,' says Liguori, 'if you have used an equivocation in making your promise; but if you have forgotten to do so (*si oblitus uti æquivocatione jurâsti*), you must.'[1] 'You must pay,' says Sanderson, 'because you have made a contract, and derived benefit from it, and called God to witness to your good faith.'

A few more contrasts will be worth selecting:—

'Titius, who promised to marry Berta when she was rich, is not bound to stand to his oath when she has fallen into poverty; having sworn to her when in good health, he is not bound to her when she has fallen into infirmity; having sworn to her in good repute, he is not bound to her in ill repute: . . . for the promise does not hold in that case.' 'In case Caius should swear to take the widow of Titius to wife, believing her, though poor, to be rich, he must take her; this error rendereth not the oath invalid, and the like is to be said of oaths of the like kind.'—*Theol. Mor.* 4. 180. *Obl. of Oaths*, p. 134.

We need not say that the first case is Liguori's, the second Sanderson's. Cardinal Cajetan and Bishop Liguori declare, as we have seen, that there is no obligation to keep an oath which has been made about an indifferent thing. Bishop Sanderson teaches that it is wrong to take such an oath, but that when it has been taken it is binding. He gives his reasons, the chief of which is, that whether a thing is weighty or trivial makes no difference with respect to truth and falsehood; and in spite of the opinion of the Romish casuists, which he supposes to have been held mainly for the purpose of supporting the distinction of mortal and venial sins, 'a leaven with which they have foully 'corrupted the whole lump of moral theology,' concludes that 'he ought not so to have sworn, but, having sworn, he ought to 'fulfil his oath.'

It is no grave sin, teaches Liguori, to use such expressions as *By God! By Christ! I will kill you!* These principles are carried out in practice. The *Mon Dieu* of the Frenchman, the *Jesus* of the Spaniard, are proverbial; the Italian expletives are not less common, though not so much confined to one species. When remonstrated with, the swearers are always ready with the excuse that they were speaking inconsiderately, and without deliberation; this is the very excuse given in Liguori's Moral Theology. Profane swearing is a habit to which Englishmen

[1] Theol. Mor. iv. 174. This is stricter than some teaching which has been p pounded. Pascal gives us another step. 'Our doctors,' replied the Jesuit, 'h taught for the benefit of those who might not be expert in the use of these re vations, that no more is required of them, to avoid lying, than simply to say they have not done what they have done, provided they have in general the i giving to their language the sense *which an able man would give to*

also, to our shame, are addicted; but mark the difference in the teaching of England's Moral Theology:—

'The cause whence such kinds of oaths are derived,' says Sanderson, 'is either a vicious habit, contracted by long and pernicious custom, which habit is the fruit and mark of a profane if not atheistical heart, or some exorbitant perturbation of the mind, as excessive anger, intemperate joy, with which, whilst the mind boils, the mouth foameth to the dishonour of God.' . . . 'Tearing the sacred and dreadful name of God with profane lips and oaths, both without fear and punishment; . . . but I would not be carried away with the tide of grief and indignation.' . . . 'A man, through some transportation of anger, love, or other passion of a perturbed mind, or through delight in sin and impious custom of swearing rashly and without judgment, besprinkleth his discourse with oaths. Which vice, in respect both of the heaviness and frequency of the sin, I could wish were more often and vehemently reprehended in sermons, as I see it was diligently and sharply done in his time by the most devout man John Chrysostom, lest, by the just judgment of God, "through oaths the earth mourns," and the Lord swear in his wrath that he will not hold them guiltless who so contemn his dreadful name that they fear not to invoke his most sacred Majesty as witness.'—Pp. 103, 130, 260.

One more contrast. We have seen that Liguori gives an almost unlimited power of getting rid of the obligation of oaths by means of Dispensations, Commutations, Irritations, Cessations, and Relaxations. Sanderson, allowing the fitness of Irritation, Cessation, and Relaxation, and admitting the propriety of Dispensation, *in the sense* of an exemption from a law by favour of the lawgiver, yet, *so far as oaths are concerned*, totally rejects both Dispensation and Commutation. To dispense with oaths, he argues, is impossible; *because* the obligation of an oath is of Divine natural law, and God has granted to none the power of dispensing with the law of nature, of which He alone is the Author—*because* the existence of a dispensing power destroys that security which is the chief end of oaths, 'for he unto whom 'the oath is made can have no assurance, if the promise of the 'party swearing may be dispensed with, that it should ever be 'fulfilled'—*because* the oath gives a right to the person to whom it is sworn, and therefore its dispensation must be either needless or unreasonable; 'needless and superfluous if it be done 'with his consent to whom the oath was made, if against it, un-'reasonable and unjust'—*because* obligation is entered into towards God as well as towards men; and even supposing the last could be taken away, 'yet would it be insupportable presumption that 'dust and ashes should arrogate unto itself authority to take 'away the obligation whereby man is bound to God as witness 'and revenger'—*because* human dispensation is a matter only of external judicature, whereas 'he that claimeth to dispense with 'oaths, assumeth unto himself Divine power, and seateth himself 'on the bench of internal judicature.'

'It is worthy of consideration,' he continues, 'first, that either the cause is manifestly just, why a thing promised by oath ought not to be performed (as if it be impossible, dishonest, or any way unlawful), and then the party swearing may of his own authority, nay, ought, without waiting for dispensation from the Pope, or any other, to retract the thing sworn; for when there is no obligation, the conscience is free and needeth no dispensation; or secondly, that no just cause appeareth why the oath should not be kept, and then it must be kept, and he who either asketh or granteth dispensation, sinneth, because the obligation, which neither can nor may be removed by human power, remaineth; or lastly, that the thing is doubtful, and it appeareth not, by reason of difficulties on both sides, whether the party swearing be bound to the performance of his promise, and then it will be profitable to consult with pious and prudent men, skilful in the Divine law, and to resolve with their advice what is most expedient. In which matter, seeing knowledge is more requisite than power, I understand not why the Pope should be fitter than another man, unless it were certain that the Pope excelled other men in prudence and piety.'—P. 239.

He does not hesitate in his conclusion:—

'Wherefore I conclude that neither pope, nor prince, nor synod, nor senate, nor ecclesiastical nor secular superior, hath any right to dispense with leagues, contracts, oaths, or to absolve any man from that bond wherein, before the dispensation granted, he was engaged.'—P. 241.

We have compared the systems of modern Rome, of primitive antiquity, and of reformed England, with respect to truth and falsehood, good faith and bad faith. There is one other authority to which we must refer, though only in a few words. Our review would not be complete without a glance at the *Theory of Truthfulness*, as laid down by the more than Moral Theologians, Moses, David, Solomon, the Prophets, and the Apostles. Thus speak Moses and Solomon:—

'If a man vow a vow unto the Lord, or swear an oath to bind his soul with a bond, he shall not break his word, he shall do according to all that proceedeth out of his mouth.' 'When thou shalt vow a vow unto the Lord thy God thou shalt not slack to pay it, for the Lord thy God will surely require it of thee, and it would be sin in thee. But if thou shalt forbear to vow, it shall be no sin unto thee. That which is gone out of thy lips thou shalt keep and perform, even a freewill offering, according as thou hast vowed unto the Lord thy God, which thou hast promised with thy mouth.' 'Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain.' 'When thou vowest a vow unto God defer not to pay it, for he hath no pleasure in fools: pay that which thou hast vowed. Better is it that thou shouldest not vow than that thou shouldest vow and not pay.'—*Numb.* xxx. 2; *Deut.* xxiii. 21; *Exod.* xx. 7; *Eccl.* v. 4.

And so David:—

'Thou shalt destroy them that speak leasing. The Lord will abhor both the bloodthirsty and deceitful man.' 'For there is no faithfulness in their mouth.' 'Who shall dwell in thy holy hill? . . . He that sweareth to his own hurt and changeth not . . . he that hath clean hands and a pure heart, who hath not lifted up his soul unto vanity, nor sworn deceitfully.' Deliver my soul, O Lord, from lying lips and a deceitful tongue.'—*Ps.* v. 6, 9; xv. 4; cxx. 2.

Jeremiah depicts the state of war and fencing to which we may be reduced:—

'Oh that I had in the wilderness a lodging-place of wayfaring men;
That I might leave my people and go from them!
For they be all adulterers, an assembly of treacherous men;
And they bend their tongues, like bows, for lies;
But they are not valiant for the truth upon the earth;
For they proceed from evil to evil, and they know not me, saith the Lord.
Take ye heed every one of his neighbour, and trust ye not in any brother:
For every brother will utterly supplant, and every neighbour will walk with slanders.
And they will deceive every one his neighbour, and will not speak the truth:
They have taught their tongue to speak lies and weary themselves to commit iniquity.
Their tongue is as an arrow shot out: it speaketh deceit:
One speaketh peaceably to his neighbour with his mouth, but in his heart he layeth wait for him.'—*Jer.* ix. 2.

'These are the things that ye shall do:
Speak ye every man the truth to his neighbour:
Execute the judgment of truth and peace in your gates:
And let none of you imagine evil in your hearts against another;
And love no false oaths, for all these are things that I hate, saith the Lord.'—*Zech.* viii. 16.

Let us hear S. Paul:—

'Wherefore, putting away lying, speak every man truth with his neighbour.'—*Eph.* iv. 25.

And S. John the Divine:—

'But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, *and all liars*, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone.'—*Rev.* xxi. 8.

It is not from want of other matter, as we stated at the beginning, that we have confined ourselves to one subject. Liguori is prolific in material. For example, we might have examined his Theory of Theft, according to which we find that no sin of theft can be mortal unless a certain quantity is stolen; that to steal 3*s.* or 4*s.* from a very opulent merchant is a mortal sin, from a very rich nobleman venial—that a wife may support her previous children out of her husband's goods against his will, and spend anything under the twentieth of his income on alms and gifts—that a nobleman in extreme distress may steal if he is ashamed to beg—that a servant may compensate himself by 'taking' if his salary is too small—that a rich man's son may steal 12*s.* from his father at any time without grave sin—that a monk's sin in stealing anything under 16*s.* from his monastery is only venial—and that a great nobleman's son commits only a venial sin whenever he steals from his father anything under or equal to 10*l.*

We might have pointed out the omissions as well as the com-

missions with which the book is chargeable. We might have shown the doctrinal corruption interspersed and taken for granted throughout. We might have submitted to our readers' scorn such ludicrous sentiments as Azorius's and Bonacina's, that a mother may wish for her daughter's death if the latter is too ugly to get married.[1] We might have held up to the just indignation of all Christians, and all men, the detestable arguments (supported by the authority of Bonacina, the Salamanca doctors, Barbosa, Suarez, Hurtado, Henriquez, and the *common* voice of the casuists in opposition to Lopez and Farinaccius) to prove that the penalty of deprivation, annexed to the commission of a sin too heinous to be named, is not incurred by Romish Priests unless they are in the constant habit of the sin: *requiritur ut actus sodomiæ sit frequentatus sive usu continuatus, ut ait Navarrus; hoc enim importat verbum*, exercentes, *in Bullâ expressum:*[2] whence Liguori draws the conclusion that, so far as penalties are concerned, 'a man who commits the act once or twice is excused.'

But we have selected the one subject of truth and lying because it lies at the foundation of all morality. When once the virtue of veracity is undermined, the whole character is ruined, and nothing can be the consequence but blindness of the moral eye and confusion of moral sentiment. From this blindness and confusion arises an adoption of principles, and specific application of those principles, in which we can only hesitate whether the shocking or the grotesque is the most prevailing element; for that which is morally wicked is always intellectually ludicrous, if we are at liberty to look at it in the latter light.

Untruthfulness is a phenomenon which is found in a remarkable degree in all the southern nations of Europe, and, we fear it must be added, in Ireland, while the northern nations are in general comparatively free from it. Thoughtful minds have often sought for an adequate hypothesis by which to account for this phenomenon. We believe that our pages will have suggested one to some minds, and confirmed it to others. When S. Philumenism is put in the place of manly faith—when all duties are merged in the one duty called by the specious name of advancing religion—when men and women put the entire direction of their souls out of their own hands into the absolute control of others, in spite of the nature which God has given them—when those who have the control of the conscience of others are supplied (and supplied by an authority which they hold infallible) with a system of moral principles and rules in which truth is flagrantly violated, good faith sapped, and t

[1] Hom. Apost. iii. 53. [2] Theol. Mor. iv. 471

obligation of oaths reduced to a trick of words, with which a hair-splitting sophist may play like counters — what can we expect but the very phenomenon which we find existing? The lock and the key answer to each other admirably.

English Romanists, we are aware, profess indignation when the charge of bad faith is brought against them. That they are saved, to a great degree, from the blight which has fallen on their co-religionists, by means of the counteracting influences amongst which they live, we readily allow. Still, even in England, things which we cannot forget have forced themselves to the light. The Gawthorn case, the Carré case, the De Col case, and many others, could, we venture to assert, have occurred only amongst Romanists. If, however, they are really anxious to prove their good faith in the face of their fellow-countrymen, let them exert themselves to get this work of S. Alfonso de' Liguori, with its lying Theory of Truthfulness, condemned by the rulers of their Church. Until this is done, we must be pardoned if we believe their word—because they are Christians—because they are men of honour—because they are Englishmen; not because they are—but in spite of their being—Romanists.

ART. III.—1. *The Preacher and the King; or, Bourdaloue in the Court of Louis XIV., being an Account of the Pulpit Eloquence of that distinguished era. Translated from the French of L. Bungener; with an Introduction by the Rev.* GEORGE POTTS, D.D., Pastor of the University Place Presbyterian Church, New York. London: Trübner & Co. 1853.

2. *Sermons Choisis de Bossuet.* Paris: 1845.

3. *Sermons du Père Bourdaloue, de la Compagnie de Jésus.* À Liege. 1784.

4. *Sermons et Morceaux Choisis de Massillon.* Paris: 1848.

WE are informed in the Introduction to this work that it has attained a wide popularity among those who use the French language, having reached the thirteenth edition. In its translated form we hardly anticipate the same result, though few subjects could have been better adapted to command the attention and excite the interest of the English literary public. There is something too circuitous about the whole character of the book, its external history, as well as its internal construction, to attract confidence, or to gain the respect of truth-loving readers. Anything which claims to admit us into the society of the great French preachers, Bourdaloue and Bossuet, must be a tempting contribution to modern literature; but we require that the images thereby created in our minds shall be authentic, shall be founded on reality—and not only the picture of some third person's imagination, about whom we know or care little. Biographical notices of any kind appeal most strongly to our love of truth. We are most unwilling that the pictures of those whom we wish to admire or study, should be represented to us under suspicious forms or untrustworthy colours. In the case before us, the memory of these great men is handed down to us through a French Protestant, that is, through one naturally in a prejudiced position, and his work, again, is translated in America, and prefaced by an American Presbyterian. Why, under these circumstances, it is even printed in England, we know not, except to make its history still more circuitous. The internal construction of the book is far also from clearing up this want of authenticity. Dr. Potts says, that 'the slight 'thread of fiction by which the disquisitions are held together, 'instead of injuring the effect of the work, as a contribution to 'sacred literature, imparts a life-like air of reality to the 'whole.' The entire book, then, by its very design, is a fiction, an historical romance, in which the opinions and the actions of the persons represented are entirely at the mercy of the writer.

To make an historical romance at all correct in the portraiture of distinguished characters, is a talent which few possess; for it requires a singular power of entering into their whole minds, and personating their very selves. Even the greatest writers in this style have always been most careful to append their narrative to undoubted events of history, and to give, moreover, some kind of references by which the faithfulness of their personal descriptions may be tested. In the book before us we look in vain for these references, nor are the facts which ought to have been referred to, sufficiently well known to dispense with the act on the part of the writer. The result, then, is that we can place no credit whatever on the truth of any ideas which have been pictured to us in this pretended account of 'Bourdaloue in the Court of Louis XIV.' But then comes the question, What can have been the motive for which this book was written? It was not to undermine the reputation of theological opponents, for those opponents are described as the most powerful, the most sincere, the most amiable of their time, and the points on which objection is made to them are too trivial to constitute the design of the work. The great preachers are eulogised in the warmest language, and indeed the apparent object of the whole story is to draw the attention of modern preachers to their powers of eloquence. The design of the writer, we would rather take it, is suffered to come out in the prominence given to another than the pretended hero of the work. Claude, the Protestant controversialist, is the man whose sentiments are really given, while Bossuet maintains a reverential silence in his presence, and Bourdaloue trembles before his stern admonitions, and receives from his dictation a portion of the sermon he is to preach before the King. Neither Bossuet, indeed, nor Bourdaloue, are allowed to talk to us, or to present to us any vivid picture of themselves; and even when they do say anything it is more or less directly under the influence of Claude that they are acting. This is the obvious absurdity of the 'thread of fiction' which constitutes the book: two great, powerful-minded, and distinguished characters are introduced into an historical romance; the public are invited to a literary treat, in hearing about these men, and then it is discovered, after all, that they are but the tools and mouth-pieces of a third person, one of some mark in his way, but about whom we are not now concerned to hear, and who moreover, as here represented, does not approve himself to our notice by the long and prosy disquisitions which are supposed to be uttered by him.

The real object of the writer was clearly to obtrude the sentiments of his own hero into close connexion with the eloquence of those great preachers of whom France is so justly proud;

and he uses an apparent liberality of tone in speaking of them, as the means of undermining the real boldness of their character as theologians. He gives no references to substantiate the most extraordinary personal combinations, and therefore we take the liberty of altogether disbelieving them, though we do not pretend to trace out the exact nature of any friendly communication that may have taken place. We have read the Life of Bourdaloue, and Claude's name does not occur in it, while Bossuet was only brought into contact with him as a controversialist. The Introduction explains thus the singular conferences which are to be described:—'Claude is introduced by 'our author into the current of his narrative, not so much for 'the purpose of dramatic effect as to afford a channel for some 'doctrines and strictures, which could not so well be put into 'the mouth of any of the other actors of the book.' No doubt the reason here alleged served the writer's part, but yet we do not consider it fair play to the memory of great men to exhibit them in false and absurd positions, in order that we may hear the doctrines or strictures of any other third person whatever. Claude no doubt was a worthy champion of Protestantism, a man of power and talent, and as such was spoken of in an honourable and fair manner by his opponent, Bossuet; but we do not believe that Bossuet ever listened to his disquisitions in the gardens of Versailles, or that Bourdaloue ever hid him behind the door of his study to hear an undignified conversation between himself and Father La Chaise.

The plot of the story rests on a certain peroration which Bourdaloue added to a sermon preached before the King at Versailles, on a Good Friday. We need not trouble our readers with all the absurd details in the history of this much-talked of peroration. It is enough to state that Bourdaloue on this occasion had as usual prepared the flattering remarks which he was accustomed to address to the King, even during the time that he was living in open adultery with Madame de Montespan. This state of affairs at Court is made the subject of conversation in a coterie of 'philosophers'—of a different type, however, from those who on the same spot made the title infamous—assembled in the gardens of Versailles. The confessor of Madame de Montespan happened at the same time to refuse her absolution, at which the King is enraged. Bossuet has conferences with the King, and endeavours to amend the scandal, by representing the necessity of Madame's departure from Versailles. He also visits Bourdaloue, whom he finds in what is said to have been the agony of learning his sermon by heart, and he discourses with him on the necessity of making certain alterations which might perhaps

move the King, and thus obtain a victory for morals and religion. This conference is interrupted by Claude, who had beforehand written to Bourdaloue, announcing his intention to call as an expression of his esteem. The Fénélons, uncle and nephew, then also come in, and much talk follows to the hindrance of any alteration in Bourdaloue's sermon. At last all go, except Claude, who slips back, and takes Bossuet's place as adviser in the sermon. Bourdaloue reads him the whole sermon, and Claude then commences to dictate a new peroration. This time also the attempt was interrupted by the arrival of a third person, Father La Chaise. Then it is that Claude rushes into concealment behind the door, and hears much conversation from the intruder, of a kind to expose the office which he held—that of confessor to the King himself—to contempt and ridicule. At length the concealed Protestant bursts forth upon the talkers —the detected Confessor skulks away, and Claude finishes his dictation. Meanwhile Bossuet has a conference with the King, and Versailles is in a tumult. Madame de Montespan perceives that things are going wrong, writes notes to the King, and retires from the palace in a fit of disgust. The King is weak and vacillating, and refuses to hear the sermon of next day, suspecting that he is to be attacked in it. Meanwhile, on the morning itself of Good Friday, the usual number of 'philosophers' promenade the palace gardens. Bossuet is late, having been so occupied with the strange commotions; Claude takes his place, and expounds the fourteenth chapter of Isaiah, making it the type of a rebuke to kings. At length the whole Court, having a mysterious notion that something great was to happen, meets in the chapel; the King at the last moment is dragged unwillingly to his place, and Bourdaloue begins the sermon. He is nervous and frightened at the rebuke which is to terminate his discourse; his courage fails; he actually commences the flattering peroration, but stops short at the first words; and why does he stop? It is Claude who ominously glares at him from behind a pillar, and shames him into fulfilling his bargain: all goes off triumphantly, the King is vanquished before all his Court; the Queen sobs with a holy joy, and Bourdaloue perceives that he is a great man, but in borrowed plumes. His conscience smites him. According to custom, he is complimented by the King in the anteroom of the chapel-royal, but again Claude is behind the door, and the story ends by the introduction of Claude to the King as the true author of the peroration just recited.

All this absurd history of pretended scenes at Versailles, is not only fiction, but it is an historical falsehood on the memory of those names which are introduced. Little notice, indeed

need be taken of such foolish misrepresentations, if it was not that the study of the great French preachers would be, as we think, most useful to the sermon-writers of the present day, and of our own Church. M. Bungener, the French Protestant, and Dr. Potts, the American Presbyterian, both no doubt appreciate their value as models of style and fertile storehouses of original thought, and on this very account desire to direct attention to them; but if we are also to study them, it is well to clear their memory of any misrepresentations which it may serve the purpose of these sectarians to connect with them. Bourdaloue, these men would say, was eloquent, was a man to be esteemed and venerated, was a keen searcher into the motives of the human heart, was an accuser of the religious faults of his day, was charitable in his way of speaking, and therefore must have been somewhat lax in his convictions with respect to church government and discipline. He was indeed a severe witness against many tendencies and practices which are still associated with Romanism; but he had little in common with the Protestants of his day, or with American Presbyterians. He denounced formalism; but he so abounds in the exposition of sound doctrine, that, except on particular subjects, where we essentially differ from the Romish Church, we listen to his words, ever with an increasing confidence in their truth, and with an increasing conviction that the Reformed Church of all lands will find that she has a common ground with him, which sectarians will in vain seek for. But this book has not even the openness to say, why the writer admires Bourdaloue. He wishes to profit by his eloquence, and at the same time cavils at him for one particular fault, which he knows is the very reverse from the common tone of his sermons. The great charge against him is, that he flattered the King in his perorations; but no mention is at the same time made of passages in the body of the sermon, acceptable no doubt for their plain speaking on some tendencies in members of his own Church, but calculated by their severity and the closeness of their appeals, to make a flattering peroration a mere empty form, little able to erase the moral axioms which had preceded it. We are not defending this practice of ending a sermon with a laudation of the King, but it was one of those court fashions, which were part of the age, for which it is difficult indeed to find a reason consistent with a Christian preacher's duty, but which cannot be laid to the account of the individual preacher. We can hardly enter into the state of things which required it, but we can understand the force of custom, and the imperative calls of court etiquette. It is also clear, that the more obvious the necessity of flattering the King was felt to

be, the less real would the words used become. They stood apart from the sermon; all that had been preached was unbiassed by their tone, and, moreover, they occupied so short a space, that the importance given to this peroration of our romantic history is obviously unnatural. The writer in fact works the subject with exactly the same feeling that prompts an English Nonconformist to cavil at certain expressions in our Liturgy, as that of 'our most religious and gracious Queen.' Moreover, the extent of the flattery is exaggerated, by construing all the expressions as referring to the individual, and not to the kingly office. Some of Bourdaloue's perorations are in fact a description of what a king ought to be, and only imply as a matter of course, as if to avoid the discourtesy of a personal lecture, that the picture is fulfilled in the actual king before him. The misrepresentations of character in the story before us are so great, that we can hardly quote the sentiments therein contained with the respect which some of them would call for.

The general subject of preaching is meant by the author to be the substance of his work, and we propose to follow him on this ground, and like him bring forward Bourdaloue and the French preachers as magnificent instances of Christian oratory. But first we shall endeavour to freshen up the recollection of our readers, as to the history of the French preachers, by appealing to actual facts, as set forth in their lives, and not in romantic fiction.

Every art and science has had its Augustan age, and the seventeenth century was undoubtedly the age of preaching. In England we had divines in that century whose memory will long continue as bright examples of the Christian ministry; but England was sadly tossed about by internal commotions, and the Church enjoyed but little peace. In France, at this period, things were however far different,—all was peace and prosperity. The regal dignity of Louis XIV. calmed the very atmosphere of France, and allowed the arts of civilized life to flourish with an unusual exuberance. It is not our present purpose to mark how that exuberance outstepped the bounds of moderation, and produced a sinful and oppressive luxury, which undermined the whole balance of social relationships. But we only now survey France under Louis XIV., as the country which took the lead, by no small distance, in all the elegance and the refinements of life. There was much vice; yet it is but fair to the Court of France at that period to say, that it was not then so rampant and unchecked as it subsequently became. Religion was respected, and if not obeyed by all, (for when is it?) yet was allowed its place and its influence. The Court had its divines, who occupied a position very much to the

public credit, and many things—even that formal love of brilliant scenes, which was in everything apparent, conduced to an appreciation of eloquence, and made the Church's preaching a valued occupation of the passing hour.

But to foster, nay, to command, this taste, there arose certain great masters of the art, whose names have long survived their own time, and who justly merit a place by the side of the many others, who, in one branch or other of human powers, have done great works, have originated new schools of art, or developed fresh tastes in the public.

There was much to favour preaching in the Court of France during the reign of Louis XIV., and to give to its professors a favourable hearing. There was but little field for eloquence in the political assemblies of so arbitrary a government as that of Louis XIV., while the dissipations of the Court did not encourage that quiet appreciation of eloquence which solitary reading may afford. Again, there was a love of witnessing personal display, which, without accusing the preachers of the day of yielding to the motives of vanity, yet materially aided the attention of those who were the listeners. Our author thus pictures the audience which assembled on the Good Friday about which he writes:—

'The royal chapel of Versailles presented, in fact, a brilliant spectacle, particularly on the days of religious solemnities. The majesty of the cathedrals was not to be looked for there: the locality did not admit of that; in 1675, the present chapel was not yet built, and the former one was rather a vast saloon than a church. But the most curious and the most dazzling object, that which scarcely allowed a stranger time to bend his attention upon the magnificence of the decorations and the service, was the crowd assembled within these walls; the most fabulous assemblage of all the great names, all the great fortunes, and all that was most illustrious in France. Among all these people, mingled and crowded in the king's chapel, like the bourgeois of Paris in their parish churches,—there were very few who did not also possess their chapel, their chaplain, and their chateau; few who could not have enthroned themselves somewhere, if they had chosen, like kings; few who were not or could not have been the heroes of the solemn praises of some village Bourdaloue. But they willingly renounced all these parish church triumphs. They did not regret to exchange for some narrow and obscure lodging at the top of the palace, the vast saloons of the habitations of their fathers; and their lordly velvet in a provincial church, did not appear to them of half the value of the untapestried end of a bench in the chapel of Versailles.'—*The Preacher and the King*, pp. 285, 286.

With audiences such as these, and with a national love of dramatic scenery to gratify, we may perhaps picture to ourselves a preacher full of affectations, straining after oratorical effect, and adopting the vulgar arts which belong to popular preaching in our own day. The case, however, was far otherwise. Bossuet, Bourdaloue, and Massillon, were genuine and real preachers of Christian truth; they were above all low and secondary arts,

which are wont to supply the place of real genius. They captivated, not by *following* the powers and tastes of their listeners, but by *leading* them. They founded a combined school of preaching, which was the same kind of addition to Christian oratory, that the works of Titian, Rafaelle and Correggio, were to painting. Indeed, their individual characters and style of writing have been illustrated by personal comparisons with these masters of Italian art. Titian represents the singular originality and richness of the courtier Bossuet. Rafaelle is analogous to the fully-developed intellect, the marked professional character, the steady adherence to his work, and, in short, to the giant pre-eminence of Bourdaloue as a preacher; while Correggio, excelling from a certain inborn delicacy of mind, and an exquisite refinement of taste, represents on his part the eloquent Massillon. Bourdaloue again has been imagined to stand in the same position to Massillon, that the bold genius of Æschylus stood to the poetic finish of Sophocles. It is remarkable in the lives of these three men, how much the mention of one of them always brings in with it the others also; yet there was no rivalry. The most interesting parts of their respective memoirs are comparisons the one with the other. The glory of one is not diminished by the others, but rather set off to greater advantage. Voltaire, indeed, maliciously accused Bossuet of retiring before the fame of the rising Bourdaloue, preferring to rest on his fame already acquired, rather than challenge competition. It is, however, proved in the memoir of Bossuet, which precedes the selection of his works now before us, that the imputation is altogether erroneous. Bossuet was only five years senior to Bourdaloue, but was known at Court much younger, and so ran his course as preacher, was appointed Bishop of Condom, and then preceptor to the Dauphin, before Bourdaloue commenced. These duties on the part of Bossuet, made it necessary that he should relinquish the occupation of Court preacher, and he had already retired to his diocese, before Bourdaloue was known. When occasions however called him out, he proved to France that his powers were not diminished, and that he was not ashamed to exercise them by fear of comparison with any one else. What must strike the reader of their lives, is indeed just the reverse to the presumption of any jealousy. Each one seems to have occupied his own place, and adopted his own line, solely according to his natural taste and disposition. There was about each of them the true independence of genius and power, which is alike above either jealousy or imitation. Bossuet was a preacher and orator; but his mind being after the mould of a finished and acute scholar, and being also a profound logician,

he took the controversial line as peculiarly his own. Bourdaloue dived into Holy Writ and the learning of the Fathers from his early youth, made them all his own, and then with the earnestness of a mind devoted to one object, he undertook the difficult task of applying this great store of truth to the wants, the dispositions, and general circumstances of each individual Christian. Thus he was an overwhelming preacher, by the very same power which made him the great casuist of his day—the adviser and confessor of all around him, rich and poor, for more than thirty years. Massillon coming after the others, and always connected with their fame, yet has distinctive marks of genius that preserve to the full the independence of his intellect. Neither of the others is equal to him in a certain touching and graphic simplicity of style. But let us consult the writers of their respective memoirs; not indeed for the purpose of aiming at any general biographical notices; but in the endeavour to illustrate that school of preaching, which we connect with their names.

Bossuet was a native of Dijon, and was educated in a Jesuit College. He was early known for his talents, and in the year 1659, being then 32 years of age, he preached his first Lent sermons in Paris. From that time he preached at Court, till he was nominated to the Bishopric of Condom in 1669. After that he was but little in the pulpits of Paris, as would appear from passages in those few sermons which he did preach on certain great occasions. At the profession of Madame de la Vallière in 1675, he states 'that in order to celebrate those 'holy ceremonies, he breaks a silence of some years, and causes 'a voice to be heard that those pulpits had ceased to know.' Again, six years later, when specially called upon by Louis XIV. to complete a course of Lent sermons, which had been interrupted by the illness of the preacher, he says, in his exhortation, 'I again take up the word after many years' continued silence.' Bossuet resigned the Bishopric of Condom, after a very brief tenure of two years, on his appointment to the preceptorship of the Dauphin, an office which, being incompatible with the care of a diocese, also prevented his frequent appearance in the pulpit. But the same office, which saved him from being often called upon, also gave him splendid opportunities for the rarer exercise of his oratory. Coming fresh and unexhausted by weekly sermon writing to his own province of oratory, what a field for his powers must those great occasions have been, when he preached the funeral orations of Madame Henriette, Duchess of Orleans, in 1670, of Marie Theresa, in 1683, of the Princess Palatine, in 1684, of the Chancellor le Tellier, in 1685, and of the great Condé, in 1687! Yet Bossuet was no mere elegant declaimer

of funeral orations to gratify a court audience; he was an ecclesiastic fighting the cause of his church against heresy and schism with the weapons of his intellect and learning, and after all those splendid orations, which we have enumerated, were long passed, it is interesting to find that in the year 1691 he preached for the benefit, not of the Court, but of his clergy, the magnificent sermon on the Unity of the Church. It is a striking proof of the richness of Bossuet's genius, that his eloquent sermons which so delighted the two Queens, Anne and Marie Theresa, of Austria, and thus brought him to the notice of Louis XIV., indeed, that all which were preached during the ten years that he was in Paris, previous to his appointment as Bishop of Condom, and which, therefore, were the cause of his promotion, were never written in a fair copy, but were only dashed on paper, full of corrections and erasions, and were never preached twice, or used at a subsequent period of his life. He could afford to let these MSS., the work of the most vigorous age of man, remain undisturbed in the depths of a confused mass of papers, unpublished, or even unknown to exist, whilst he, far from resting on his oars after his elevation to the highest rank of the church, went boldly on to establish, as it were, another reputation. Nor were these papers ever put together till after the death of his nephew and executor, the Bishop of Troyes, long before which time, and therefore, by other compositions, he had acquired an immortal fame in literature as well as religion. Cardinal Maury, the writer of the preliminary discourse to Bossuet's sermons, goes into raptures of enthusiasm, which in our dull country—whether the fault be in the preachers or the audience we say not—sound unusual as comments on sermon writing. Yet the cardinal's enthusiasm is natural and sincere; and it is also graphic. 'What has struck me' (we indulge here in a kind of running translation, full of curtailment, for the original would cover our pages far too rapidly,) 'in his sermons is the constant vigour 'which marks his style, and which, it appears to me, far sur-'passes the boasted elegance of modern writers. In the first 'sentence you see his genius in action. You meet with no trivial 'forms, no commentaries on the thoughts of others, no lengthiness, 'sterility, or redundance. He does not walk; he runs, he flies; 'ever in some new path which his imagination opens to him: he 'throws himself at once towards his goal, and carries you with 'him.'

Bossuet's fame as a controversialist at one time quite caused him to be forgotten as a preacher. The cardinal, therefore, undertakes to bring out his excellence in this respect, in a manner which implies that, at the time he wrote, his beauties

were not fully recognised. He says, 'It is commonly thought 'that Massillon and Bourdaloue have placed limits to the diffi- 'cult art of the pulpit, and that, having borne away the riches 'of oratory, they have left nothing for others, but the minor 'glory of gleaning in their traces. I have always suspected 'that this error would not be accredited, if the sermons of 'Bossuet had been read. Let us admire the productions of 'genius, but not have the rashness to set bounds to them by 'saying that none others can surpass those whom we already 'know. How many great beauties shall we find in Bossuet, 'which we shall vainly seek for in Massillon and Bourdaloue. 'Again, how many new beauties may one day distinguish an 'orator, even after Massillon, Bourdaloue, and Bossuet!' He then compares these three with each other, mentioning their respective characteristics. Thus it is that we cannot enter upon any notice of one, without including the others also. He considers that Massillon, endowed by nature with fine talents, full of the learning of the ancients, and embellished by an exquisite taste, wrote more often with his mind than his imagination; that he was more ornamental, but less brilliant than Bourdaloue; that his enchanting elocution could not conceal his inclination to imitate his great model, Cicero; that though he wrote with interest and charm, yet that, without any uneasiness for his glory, one may say that he sometimes abused the fertility of his style by too great refinement in working out an idea. 'Without this ravishing elegance of style,' he says, 'one would 'not read Massillon more than once; though with it his sermons are too soon over.' In contrast with this dependence on style rather than matter, he describes Bourdaloue as the great reasoner, always consistent, always nervous, preferring to passing impulses the solid proofs which time engraves more deeply upon the mind. He is pathetic where the matter needs it, but this, in his judgment, was only when the great truths of religion could acquire interest by this manner of stating them. He never allowed his touching passages to come back, as it were, on himself. He instructs others by forgetting himself. The Cardinal brings forward, as an example of Bourdaloue's style, the same Good Friday sermon, about which the 'Preacher and the King' is written, though only to add thereto a termination which was not his own. The first part of that sermon, in which he proves that the death of the Son of God was the great triumph of His power, is considered by Maury to be a perfect *chef d'œuvre* of eloquence, and that nothing can be put by the side of it. 'Bourdaloue,' he says, 'is still more valued at 'the third reading than at the first. The more one reads, the 'more one admires. I thank him that he has made no display

'of language; he wrote nothing for want of thought.' Bossuet he considers to have been born with more genius, to have been more brilliant in occasional passages of his sermons, to have been more poetic, more picturesque, but the other to have been more even, more complete, and more methodical. He then compares Bossuet to Homer among the classic writers, and to Isaiah among the prophets, and describes his preaching somewhat as follows:—'He endeavours to alarm, then gives them 'up to remorse. He combats with his audience, and fights to 'the death, as Madame de Sevignè described him. He took 'the range of Holy Scriptures, the Old Testament and the New, 'and explained them as one harmonious whole, not by quoting 'passages in a dry and barren manner, but by making the very 'thoughts and ideas of Scripture his own, and then setting 'them forth with all the freshness of an original picture. Did 'he wish to show a king disabused of the greatness of the 'world; he repeated the long groanings of David. If he wished 'to excite pity, he made his audience weep with him over the 'pathetic history of Jeremiah, and in his sympathy with Jere-'miah, he seemed to be inspired with a new energy to depict 'the calamities of Zion. Little satisfied, however, with first 'emotions, he pursued the impression, and deeply penetrated 'all hearts with the interest he created.'

We do not follow Bossuet through his controversial writings. He is charged with haughtiness, with some infirmities of temper, and with such warmth in controversy, that he sometimes thought more of vanquishing his antagonist than of adhering to the true basis on which the question before him rested. Be this as it may, he was a noble and zealous defender of his Church, free from the scandals, secular and ecclesiastic, of his age, and a man of sublime genius. There are times when bishops of active genius and power, and of resolute zeal in their office, who really will fight for the Church, acquire in our estimation a marvellous dignity. Many causes militate against the frequent occurrence of this desired picture, but we value it all the more when so many bright and excellent qualities shine forth in history as raising up the lasting name of Bossuet, Bishop of Meaux, for such he became in 1681, after the education of the Dauphin was concluded. He died in 1704, within a month of Bourdaloue, who was five years his junior.

As a kind of appendix to the 'Preacher and the King,' there is a marvellous narrative, called 'Two Evenings at the Hotel de Rambouillet,' and supposed to be descriptive of the first occasion on which Bossuet became known for his talent of preaching to the fashionable world of Paris. This was published, it is stated in a note, as long ago as 1839, but no earlier

reference is given as any pretence of its authenticity: and as it is here inserted because it is thought that the readers of the 'Preacher and the King' would be pleased with it, we presume that the one is no more true than the other; for the lovers of this kind of romantic fiction, which deals so rashly with historic names, and the lovers of sober facts, are certainly distinct classes of readers. The narrative in question relates how that, for the amusement and criticism of an evening party, the young Bossuet erected a temporary pulpit in the saloon of the Hotel de Rambouillet, and actually preached a powerful and a serious discourse, in exactly the same manner that he might have acted charades. This may have been the case, or it may not; we do not pretend to have before us every event that enlivened the saloons of Paris in the 17th century, but as the story is certainly calculated to represent Bossuet in anything but a dignified position, we must claim better authority before we believe that there is any truth in it. Bossuet may have had a natural love of distinction, and his share of ambition; but a ludicrous exhibition of vanity and profaneness is not what we should look for as a commencement of a career which bears the mark of great power and the highest genius, and which claimed an unusual degree of veneration, not only from his own country but from members of our own Church also, as Nelson and Bishop Bull.

From the 'Eagle of Meaux,' an epithet significant of the brilliant genius of Bossuet, we shall now turn our attention to some points in the life and character of Bourdaloue, as set forth in the Preface to his Sermons, by Father Bretonneau.

Nothing so entirely overawes the more ordinary type of mankind, as the contemplation of a life wholly consistent, wholly devoted from the earliest period of youth to one great object and one steady career, especially where there is evidence that this consistency has its foundation in the very disposition of the mind for steadiness of work, and not in any self interest or reward kept always in view. Bourdaloue was a hard steady worker from boyhood. Moreover, he did not put before him any particular object of ambition as the motive of steadiness, but he worked from day to day, and left the issue to Providence. He was one of those men, of whom it is commonly said that they do not owe their success to genius. If a man really plods on through a long and steady life, he is accused of not being a genius. But there may be a cultivated genius as well as an ill-regulated brilliancy which often claims that little all to itself. Bourdaloue proves his genius as well as his
sermon. There is the mass of learning
labour, and there is also the spark o
all with an individual clearne

one great idea; which seems to command for the time, with a tenacious grasp of mind, the wisdom of heaven and earth to demonstrate its truth. Bourdaloue was born at Bourges in 1632. His father, a man of good family, had at one time exhibited considerable powers of oratory, but had not cultivated them for any practical purpose. At the age of fifteen the son was given up to the order of Jesus, full of promise and youthful talent. In the Jesuit college he remained no less than eighteen years in profound study, in teaching, and as Professor of philosophy and theology. He gained great distinction in the sciences, and at one time was about to follow them as the main object of his life, a fact which is important as showing that eminence in the pulpit was not any vainglorious object of ambition during his years of study. Various sermons which he preached, as Professor of Moral Philosophy, induced his superiors to confine his talents to the pulpit; and, submissive to their disposal, he henceforth became a preacher. He was known to the great Mademoiselle, who heard him at Eu, and impressed with a certain confidence in him, she summoned him to act as her Confessor in her last moments. After a few years in the provinces he was called, in 1669, to Paris, and there he commenced his Advent sermons before the King. His powers surpassed all hopes, and, far from being sought for only as a novelty, his reputation increased every year, and the more he was heard the more desire there was to hear him. He possessed every advantage physical and mental, that is required for an orator. A solid foundation of reasoning was joined with a lively imagination; and a facility in giving interest and originality to common truths, was combined with a singular power of making all he said to bear the impress of a strong and earnest faith in the spiritual life. His was not the beauty of style or art, but there is about his writing a body and a substance, together with a unity and steadiness of aim that made the simplest language to assume the power and the greatness of the highest oratory. 'He embodied the Fathers,' says his biographer, 'who seemed 'indeed to have spoken for him; so easily did their words flow 'from his mind.' Of Scripture writers he most often quoted Isaiah and S. Paul; while, of the early writers of the Church, he was most fond of Tertullian, S. Augustine, and S. Chrysostom. He spoke well without the least apparent wish to do so; his delivery was quick, and void of all affectation; but when he became elevated or pathetic, there was a certain majesty of tone, yet he was never extravagant. His voice was full and sounding, but sweet and harmonious. He inspired a singular lence in all who heard him from the perfect knowledge he yed of the human heart, a knowledge which he acquired

by deep searchings into himself. Though but one man, he seemed to be the whole world in himself. He preserved his reputation unchecked until death, and preached at the Court and in Paris for thirty-four years, during which time he was heard with equal delight by rich and by poor. His eloquence being natural and true, it pleased all tastes and all times. Touched with his preaching, many came to him to unburden their souls in confession, and to seek from him spiritual direction. He did not reject these; but, on the contrary, he thought nothing better than to cultivate what he had planted, and to bring to perfection in the confessional what he had excited in the pulpit. In the direction of consciences, his advice was solid, neither too rigorous nor too indulgent. He knew how to instruct every condition of life in its own duties, and was firm without regard to quality or rank. For four and six hours a day would he be employed in this most fatiguing work of the confessional, peculiarly restraining to one of his natural vivacity. He gave himself up to benefit all states and conditions of life,—the sick, the poor,—and entered into their smallest wants with interest and sympathy. The more his great fame deterred some from venturing to consult him, the more he courted them, and went to seek them that he might soften their misfortunes. To the dying his vigilance was doubled. 'He did not waste their precious moments in vague and useless discourse, but truly and earnestly brought all his vast knowledge of the human heart to aid in preparing each soul to meet its Judge.' Nor in thinking of others did he forget himself. Success did not dazzle him, but the more his fame increased the more was he on his guard. Wrapped up in his sacred calling, he acquired a genuine contempt for the world, without failing in any duty he owed to it. He was a punctual observer of the rules of his order, in prayers especially. At the foot of the altar, and in reciting the Divine Office, he called to mind those great ideas of religion which afterwards were heard from the pulpit. He was noted in all concerns of life for frankness, good faith, truthfulness, shrewdness, and penetration. His manner was reserved, but engaging, and he enjoyed a sweetness and modesty of temper which prompted him always to speak well of others and not of himself.

Towards the end of his life he resolved to quit Paris and live in holy retirement. For this purpose he addressed himself to the head of the Society, but was desired to reconsider his wish for another year, for old as he was, renowned and full of labour as his whole life had been, this man, to whom all Paris had looked with an extraordinary admiration for the period of a generation of men, was yet, as a member of the Society of Jesus, entirely at the disposal of his superiors; he had no

liberty of action, and was but part of a great system controlled by others. Eminence as a preacher could never raise him to ecclesiastical dignities forbidden to his order, nor did it even give him rule over that order itself. He had then again to supplicate for a peaceful end to all his labour. His letter is so touching that we translate the extract from it which Father Bretonneau lays before us:—

'My very Reverend Father,—God inspires me and even urges me to have recourse to you as our father, and to supplicate you humbly but earnestly to grant me what I have been unable, in spite of all my efforts, to obtain from the reverend father of the province. It is fifty-two years since I joined his company, more for others than myself. A thousand things distract me and prevent me from labouring as I should wish for my own perfection, which yet is the only thing necessary. I wish to retire and lead from henceforth a more tranquil life. I say a more tranquil in order that it shall be more regular and more holy. I feel that my body becomes weak and drawing towards its end. I have finished my course, and God grant I may be able to add I have been faithful. I am at an age when I am no longer in a condition to preach; may it be permitted me to employ, only for God and myself, what remains of life, and to dispose myself by that means to die religiously. La Flèche, (or some other house that shall please the superiors; I do not ask for one in particular, provided I am removed from Paris,) shall be the place of my repose. There, forgetting the things of the world, I will review before God all the years of my life in the bitterness of my soul. This is the subject of all my prayers, &c.'

This letter had its desired effect. He was free to do what he judged right, and as soon as he received the answer from Rome he made preparations to depart. But the same superiors that had stopped him the first time delayed him again, whilst they remonstrated with the general Father. The issue of it was that Bourdaloue was to remain at Paris. 'God willed that he should 'thus have all the merit of a religious sacrifice without putting 'it into execution, and that he should finish his own sanctifica-'tion while labouring for others.' This was not known till after his death, for it was no honour for himself, but it was God that he was seeking. He did not insist, but went back to his labours with renewed activity and ardour. This however, was not for long. On the 11th of May, 1704, being the feast of Pentecost, after saying mass with difficulty, he was seized with a malignant fever which he felt would be his death. 'It is enough,' said he, 'I must now do what I have often advised others to do.' The next day he confessed all his life and received the last Sacraments. He regarded himself as a criminal condemned to death by the judgment of heaven. 'I have abused life,' he said, 'and 'I deserve that you shall take it from me, and with all my 'heart I submit to so just a chastisement.' After performing various acts of religion, commending himself to God, and offering his death, in union with that of Christ as a victim to appease the anger of God, he then put in order his papers as if in perfect

health, and even gave some hope of amendment. He was not, however, flattered by this last spark of life; he felt that only a miracle could save, and he thought himself unworthy of this. In the evening he relapsed and became delirious. The next morning he expired in the seventy-second year of his age, dying in the exercise of his ministry with an interval of but two days.

No portrait of him was taken during his life; the shop-windows of Paris did not display the fashionable preacher in silken robe and self-complacent attitude. But after death it was thought that the features of so remarkable a man ought to be handed down to posterity, and therefore it is that his likeness is represented with closed eyes. The writer of the 'Preacher and the King' can hardly have been aware of this circumstance, for he speaks of Bourdaloue's eyes being closed as a habit in preaching, to assist a treacherous memory. This is an obvious assumption derived simply from his portrait. It is moreover absurd to represent so great a master of oratory as was Bourdaloue, labouring under the utter confusion of mind in the delivery of a sermon which this author of a 'slight thread of fiction' ascribes to him.

Massillon may conclude our biographical notice of the three great preachers of France, taking as our text the preface to that selection of his works placed at the head of our article. In thus passing from one character to the other, there is a pleasant variety, a refreshing change of sentiment, unalloyed by any depreciating comparisons. The difference between them was that of nature and of circumstances, over which neither had any control; it was not a difference which arouses in our minds the least moral preference. As Bourdaloue is grand and overawing from the solid foundation of true talent, of immense and consistent study, of extreme diligence and method in the composition of sermons; and lastly, of true and earnest piety which inspired their delivery with a crushing eloquence; so is Massillon equally powerful in his character and reputation, from a beauty of style, from a touching art of really gaining hold of the soul, and from a simple and devout phraseology; a beauty which the consideration of his whole career affords convincing proof was the true reflex of his inmost self, and not any external power of expression unconnected with the fountain of his real feelings. Massillon was born in Provence, in 1663, and was the son of a poor citizen. He was thus the origin of his own fortune, and confers honour upon his patrons who sought out merit and were not guided by influence in the exercise of their patronage. He entered the Oratory at seventeen, resolved to consecrate his labours to the

Church, and preferring the greater freedom of that order to the indissoluble ties of the great Jesuit. His superiors soon destined him for the pulpit, and he alone saw not the eminence before him. He shunned the first inroads of praise, and grieved over the sensation his own eloquence produced. It fell to him to preach the funeral orations of M. de Velleroy, Archbishop of Lyons, and of M. de Villars, Archbishop of Vienne. These were, indeed, but youthful essays; but he was so overwhelmed with applause, that, fearing the demon of pride, he went to the abbey of Septfonds, where the rules of La Trappe were followed. During his noviciate there a mandate was received from Cardinal de Noailles, which needed an answer. The Abbé himself, more pious than eloquent, deputed this task to the young Massillon. The Cardinal not fearing to offend the Abbé's pride by assuming that it was not his own writing, inquired who was the author, and having gained the information, recalled Massillon to the Oratory. Massillon excelled in eloquent appeals to the soul; he agitated and frightened his hearers, but did not overwhelm or depress them. His delivery was sweet, simple, touching, with a rich easy flow of language. That he was conscious of this power is evident from his answer to one who expressed his admiration of his language; 'The devil has already told me more eloquently than you.' His manner was quiet, his eyes cast down, and he used but little action. He did not excite his audience, but had a singular power of producing a profound silence. The Court early desired to hear him, and he preached before Louis XIV. who received him with the greatest favour. His first text before the gay French Court was, 'Happy they who mourn.' It is of him that it has been said under different versions of the same story, that he sent away from his preaching, not admirers of himself, but converted sinners. It is singular indeed that this practical commendation should have been peculiarly his, for he of all other preachers was the man, from the natural grace of his language, to suggest personal admiration. It was probably for this very reason that the refutation of any such weakness is especially mentioned to his honour. He suggested the idea, and therefore claimed its contradiction. Massillon, as is not unfrequently the case with men of such peculiar sweetness of temper, excited very great envy, and many prejudices against him were industriously circulated. The consequence of this was that for the last eleven years of Louis XIV.'s life he never preached at Versailles. Louis XIV. died in 1715, and Massillon commenced preaching in 1699; therefore only five years are left, during which his preaching was contemporaneous with Bourdaloue, for the raising his name to distinction and his

sermons at Court during that reign. It is said that, after Bourdaloue's death, he suffered from an extraordinary unwillingness on the part of the Parisian public to admit any other preacher into the place of one whom for so many years they had adored. The jealousy, however, between the Jesuits and Oratorians probably accounted for it. Two years after Louis XIV. died, he was appointed Bishop of Clermont, partly, it is said, that the business of a remote diocese might prevent him from preaching in Paris to the discomfiture of many inferior aspirants then rising up. It was in this interval that he again returned to Court, and that he preached his celebrated *Petit Carême* before the young king, then nine years of age. These sermons are on the relationships which should exist between a king and his subjects, and generally on the bearing of different orders of society, the one to the other. The Abbé de Fleury well illustrated the exquisite fitness of these sermons for the young king, and the close application of their counsel to the circumstances for which they were preached, by comparing Massillon, in their delivery, to the prophet Elisha, lying upon the child of the Shunammite woman, putting his mouth upon his mouth, his eyes upon his eyes, and his hands upon his hands.

Massillon, from the commencement of his episcopate, set a brilliant example in his zeal to perform the duties of a bishop. He carried out most strictly the law of residence. He no longer preached at Paris, but devoted all his powers to the well-being of his diocese, where his chief energies were exerted in works of love and self-sacrifice. He was profusely liberal in almsgiving, and was only restrained, by feelings of justice to his successor, from giving up every secular right and privilege of his office. He was content with the smallest allowance for personal expenses, and never betrayed one lingering thought of regret for a Parisian life. His delight was to assemble in his palace those who differed in opinion, that he might see, under the influence of his loving spirit, all asperities softened. Oratorians and Jesuits, most jealous of each other, he set down together at the chess-board, telling them, with a fatherly smile, never to be more serious in their opposition and contests. It is in Massillon's sweetness of life, in his diffusion of charity and good-will all around him, as if Christian love was the very atmosphere he breathed, that we have the surest proof of the sincerity of his eloquence. The sweetness and beauty of his words came from a heart that was in harmony with them. Like the other great preachers we have noticed, Massillon was a reformer of corruptions and abuses, or a declaimer against them. Bossuet strove hard in controversy for a reconciliation of Western Churches, and would have granted many con-

cessions, to receive the divided members of Christendom into one Church; and Massillon, by practical discipline in his diocese, put down many of those profane observances and disgraceful processions which had sprung up in the Gallican Church. He issued an order for their suppression, and a tumult was created, which none could quell till Massillon himself brought into good service that power of producing silence which was the attribute of his eloquence. He calmed the multitude, and gained his end. The people of his diocese adored him; they hailed him as he passed by them, with 'Long live our Father!' and, as if to prove how true this greeting was, they mourned his loss with many touching tokens of regret. He died in 1742, 'as a bishop should die, without money, and without debts.'

The biographical notice before us concludes with some interesting criticisms, of the same character that we met with in Bossuet's Memoirs, on the comparative merits of Bourdaloue and Massillon. Various analogous conjunctions of names are again brought forward, such as putting Massillon in the same relation to Bourdaloue as Cicero was in to Demosthenes, and Racine to Corneille,—but these are wisely rejected as useless parallels,—and a few impartial comments made on the different circumstances of each. 'When Bourdaloue appeared, the pulpit,' it is said, 'was still barbarous, vying with the theatre in buf-'foonery, and with the scholar in dryness. The Jesuit, there-'fore, as preceding Massillon, would naturally acquire the 'greater glory at the time, in establishing a more worthy style 'of preaching. He who first pulls up the thorns, gains the 'greatest celebrity.' Now, however, that we are far removed from the circumstances of their respective lives, there is no doubt that Massillon is the more general favourite, and that it is popularly considered the greatest glory of Bourdaloue that the preeminence of the other is disputed. 'Bourdaloue,' our writer says, 'is only read by preachers and by pious souls,' that is, for devotion and instruction, while all read Massillon. In point of quantity, the latter exceeded: but here it must be remembered that Bourdaloue stood a greater test than the others, inasmuch as he preached for a much greater length of time before the Court, which then was the acutest audience in France. He preached at the Court for thirty-four years, while Massillon was only very occasionally at Versailles, and left Paris altogether when in the prime of life. Voltaire, we are informed, took Massillon as his model of prose writing, and had on his table the *Petit Carême* by the side of *Athalie*, which was his favourite poem. Massillon, it is said, once failed in remembering his sermon, when preaching before Louis XIV. Making a short pause, the king said to him, 'It is well that you pause,

'in order that we may dwell on the fine and useful things you 'have told us.' After this he was accustomed to read his sermons; and so much stress did he wisely lay on ease of delivery, that when asked which of his sermons he thought were best, he replied, 'those which he knew best.'

Even with this short notice of the three great preachers, Bossuet, Bourdaloue, and Massillon—for our author takes no notice of him who was contemporaneous with the two first, we mean the celebrated Fléchier—we think it must be clear that they earned their name by most worthy and legitimate means, and that they fully deserve to be classed as a school of sermon-writing, which all ages would benefit themselves by studying. Studying we say; for let us protest against young divines translating and preaching these sermons as they stand. Much of their aroma is lost in translation: an English congregation is not the French Court; and, with all their excellences, they betray the artist and science of composition. English taste, as well as English needs, require something more plain, didactic, and personal. Besides, the lapse of a century, or a century and a half, makes a vast change in the requirements of the pulpit. Still, let these great preachers be studied. The brilliant genius of Bossuet, full of similes and figures—the real substance and method of Bourdaloue—with the finished oratory of Massillon, would be a course of study that could not fail to improve any one's preaching, especially when the whole lives of these literary models are known to have been also most bright examples of different vocations in the Church of Christ. The principal object of study, for practical use, would, we feel sure, be Bourdaloue. He was the preacher by profession. His sermons are a perfect mine of fresh and beautiful ideas, and of grandly displayed theological truths. Take, for instance, his sermon on the Passion, before alluded to, where he proves the cross to have been the triumph of the power of the Son of God. In reading that sermon, there is nothing to prepare one for anything grand. He begins in a quiet, scholar-like manner; with great method and order, he lays out the plan of his sermon; he exhibits no marks of dashing off a brilliant piece, in a fit of enthusiasm: but, after reading for a short time, a vivid and a striking picture dawns upon one which can never be forgotten. The Cross, as it were, stands out before one's mind, covered with high trophies of honour and glory, taken from every age of revelation, and every narrative that is told us in Scripture as past or to come. The prophets, in foretelling of the Cross, all contribute to the power of Him who died on it. His own foreknowledge, and His own willing submission to the pains of death, increase also, under this description, beyond all human

appreciation, that glory which could both create the highest wonder of divine truth, and also, at the same time, be the passive victim of its operation. Bossuet's style is eminently intellectual, but often rather too metaphysical for popular comprehension. He is a deep prober into self-deception, and seems to turn the human heart completely inside out, in portraying how crafty and insidious are the many forms of deception. Yet even these sermons are based on such a sound philosophy, and there are in them so many simple appeals to real goodness of heart, that the metaphysical parts are cleared up, and the whole rendered brilliant by a series of vivid pictures. In his sermon on the text, 'I delight in the law of God after the inward man,' the real depth of his philosophy is worthy of our own Bishop Butler, though clothed in more easy and attractive language. The law of God in the inward man is described as analogous, in the first instance, with the law which every other creature must have for its own guidance,—with this difference, however, that man's law is a ray of divine light, which he, having an intelligent spirit, may see, and by which he may freely direct himself. The mystery of illumination, which baptism is called, renews this inward law, and makes it to be within us a kind of mirror, into which we should ever be looking to see our true nature. He then describes the many ways in which people, on the one hand, deceiving themselves, before they will look into this mirror, dress themselves up in false colours; and, on the other hand, dreading their own deformity as seen by themselves, deface the mirror itself, and violently corrupt its purity as a clear reflection of the plain word of God.

Bourdaloue treats the subject of self-deception in another and characteristic manner. In his sermon on Christian and Pharisaic severity, he draws most wonderful pictures of false severity. He does not accomplish his end by brilliant similes or figures, but by a number of earnestly-stated reflections, and well-drawn descriptions of many kinds of severity, such as outward discipline, the frequent use of the confessional, fasting, the pride of a moral life, &c., in which many self-willed persons find a substitute for that noble devotion, which really offers up, in true severity, the secret inclinations of the heart, the inward pride of reason, and the love of self. The sermons of Bourdaloue are blamed for their many divisions and subdivisions, and for their exact and studied method. In him this was necessary, otherwise the prodigious variety of matter would have created only confusion of mind in the hearers. The sermons, again, are much longer than we are now accustomed to hear, and therefore would naturally require several breaks and changes to keep up attention. Subdivisions are intolerable when there is no subject

matter in the first instance to divide: but, used as they are by Bourdaloue, we think that they give a peculiar dignity to the opening of the sermon. What, moreover, are objected to by M. Bungener, as too refined subdivisions, are not such at all, but only different ways of conveying the ideas of his main divisions. As an extreme instance, he gives the following scheme of his sermon on final impenitence:—

'The first die in a state of actual impenitence; the second, without any feeling of penitence; the last, in the delusion of a false penitence. The first are the most criminal, the second the most unhappy; the third are neither so criminal as the first, nor so unhappy as the second; they are, however, unhappy because they are blinded, and criminal because they are sinners. I shall accordingly, call the impenitence of the first, a criminal impenitence,—that of the second, an unhappy impenitence,—that of the third, a disguised impenitence. And after having delineated these three characters, I shall add three reflections. An impenitent life conducts to criminal impenitence at death, by the way of inclination; this is my first part. An impenitent life conducts to unhappy impenitence at death, by the way of punishment; this is my second division. An impenitent life conducts to disguised impenitence at death, by the way of deception; this is my third division.'—*Ibid.* pp. 57, 58.

Now first: this translation, though fair on the whole, is still expressed with peculiar bareness, and no judgment can be formed without reading the previous introduction to this briefly laid down plan. In the original sermon, this passage comes naturally enough, and does not astonish the reader with the same appearance of intricacy which it is here made to assume. Apart, however, from this question, it is evident that there are after all no subdivisions here given. He starts with three main divisions, and is anxious that a distinct idea should be impressed on the minds of his hearers, as to each of these three heads, which are to be brought before them. He therefore repeats that one idea in different words; he does not however subdivide it. In his noble sermon on the Holy Trinity, he follows out the same method with a most happy effect. After giving out the text, 'In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost,' he opens in this striking yet simple manner, 'Behold, 'Christian, in three words the summary of our faith, the foun-'dation of our religion, the mark of our profession, the most 'august of our mysteries.' After a solemn exordium on the grandeur of the subject, he then, 'that he may speak usefully,' lays down three propositions, *i. e.*, three ideas which are to be worked out in the three main parts of his sermon. First, that the profession of this faith is the most glorious act we can render to God; second, that it is the most solid foundation of our hopes; and, thirdly, that it is the bond of charity which ought to exist among the faithful. Here are three ideas, and

he then proceeds, not to subdivide them, but to explain them a second time, and to look at them from a different light. The first, he says, will show us what we do for God, the second what we do for ourselves, and the third what we ought to do for each other. He even does this again, describing the first as the greatest homage of faith, the second the greatest subject of confidence, and the third the most powerful motive to charity. In following out this sermon, we are no more involved in the subject of division, except to announce the opening of each of these parts. No subdivisions even then occur—but each idea is worked out in a plain and natural manner, and in this sermon especially, with the greatest beauty. Each of these parts would form a sermon of the length common among ourselves, and in this there would occur not a single formally stated division. Sermons on Trinity Sunday, in our own Church, are often dreaded as especially dull: but it is Bourdaloue's art to rise with the dignity of his subject, and to give a singular interest to what may be thought dogmatic statements. He associates the names of the Sacred Trinity with each most solemn period of life, and each act of our love to God. He shows these Names to be a very part of our Christian life, and with an awful pathos, pictures the last offices of the Church over the dying, when these Holy Names are then all in all.

The conclusion which M. Bungener draws from this alleged refinement of divisions, is as follows:—

'It is accordingly not astonishing, that he has such difficulty in learning his sermons, such fear of losing a single word. Pages written in this way must be memorized like the Lord's Prayer. Let a single idea escape you,—all is lost; drop a single link, and you are at a loss where to take it up again. From this course proceeds the inexpressible anguish, which our illustrious friend never fails to experience until he reaches the last word of his sermon. His eyes almost always closed, his motions uneasy,—his sentences too fast or too slow,—his gestures often unsuited to his subject,—everything betrays the prodigious effort of memory which is an actual torture to himself, and to those who are so unfortunate as to perceive it. Moreover, he does not attempt to conceal it from himself; he submits to it, as the sailor to his oar, and the peasant to his plough. It is not until after he has preached the same discourse several times, that he begins to be confident, and himself to join a little in the pleasure which his words confer upon us.'—*Ibid.* pp. 58, 59.

We can only make one comment on this statement, which is, that we neither believe in the causes or the result here described, any more than we believe that he preached with his eyes shut, because his portrait was taken after his death.

Bourdaloue's style is one to inspire a fatherly confidence in his hearers. All his little apostrophes and reflections, his epithets of affection, his addresses to Sacred Persons, are all introduced with singular skill, or rather with the eloquence of

truth and sincerity. Intellectually also he inspires great confidence by his calm and clear announcements, at the opening of a sermon, of what he is about to do. We feel that there is power and substance in him, as he methodically informs you of his plan. Never also did he deceive this confidence. If you read an elaborate exordium, you will find every particular fully developed; the plan is no framework, destitute of contents that are worthy of or in proportion to itself. There is no appearance of its being the chief work in the sermon, but it plainly assumes the subordinate and proper place, of marshalling and arranging a great mass of thought previously conceived. One great strength which Bourdaloue enjoys in framing his eloquence, is his own deep reverence for the great truths of religion, and the ministrations of the Church. He speaks not as an individual, but as the humble enunciator of the views and counsels of the Christian Church. This gives him a dignity far more than personal, and inspires a confidence in his words, quite of a different, and that higher kind, from any affectations of art, however successful they might be. There is throughout his sermons a grand elevation, yet simplicity of tone, which keeps you nearer to the pathetic than you are quite aware of; till all at once—with the subject, and not with the preacher—you find yourself, by a wonderfully slight transition, in the very realms of poetry, though you imagined yourself but in an even flow of quiet prosaic teaching. As a collection of sermons, Bourdaloue's are as complete as any extant. The fifteen volumes before us go through every Sunday and holiday of the Christian year. There are several courses for Advent and Lent, and many occasional sermons for charitable institutions, besides many others on subjects not peculiar to any season or occasion.

What now can be said of the sermons of Massillon? In the first place, it may truly be said that his sermons are undoubtedly written in a style which will bear a more direct transfer to the English pulpit than either of the other two we have mentioned. As coming last, his language is a step more in advance towards the easy flow of modern writing. The fact also that so much more space is occupied by him in bringing out each idea, makes it more practicable with the majority of writers to feel at home in his style, than in one more strongly contrasted with their own, by greater profusion of thought. Massillon is much more generally known in England than the others; the touching gentleness of tone, especially on subjects that meet with popular favour, gives him a preeminence in modern taste which it would be hard to supplant. Take for instance his sermon on the widow's son of Nain, which he

divides into the two subjects of fearing death too much, and also too little, both leading us to put the thought of death from us. On subjects and reflections of this kind, Massillon is unequalled. There is, however, this difference between Massillon and the others. If you take Massillon at all, you must take his language verbatim; whereas from the others you derive ideas, which may reappear in anyother dress. On the whole we should say that, however distorted some of M. Bungener's remarks about Bourdaloue may be, he is right in the following comparison of the respective claims of him and Massillon to the fame of posterity:—

'As to the reputation of Bourdaloue, whether as orator or writer,—the brilliancy which it has resumed in our days is one sign of the return of the public taste, and of literature in particular, to solid and serious things. Now, this could not be the case in regard to the reputation of Bourdaloue, without thereby casting more or less reflection on that of Massillon. The latter for a long time had the misfortune, we will not say of being too much praised, but of being too openly preferred to his illustrious rival; in proportion as people were just towards the one, they became severe towards the other. "The greatest glory of Bourdaloue," said D'Alembert, "is that the superiority of Massillon should be still a contested point." Massillon's greatest glory, we should say at the present time, is that he yet has the honour to be put on a footing with Bourdaloue. "*Oportet illum crescere, me autem minui*," said the Jesuit, when, old, and broken down, he beheld the first successes of the young and brilliant orator; and behold posterity reverses it. It is for you, Massillon, to decrease, and for you, Bourdaloue, to increase.

'Is this as it should be? We think so. Not that we approve of those people who cannot praise one man without undervaluing another; but in this case there is something more reasonable and better founded than the old mania for criticism, or rather the old mechanical necessity of the human heart.

'From continually hearing the style of Massillon commended, we have contracted the habit of considering him as nothing more than an able artificer in style. From this cause, his immense reputation in the eighteenth century, a period when style was everything; from this also, the loss of this reputation, which could not fail to take place in the nineteenth, when principles have resumed the precedence of form, and thought the precedence of style.'—*Ibid.* pp. 233, 234.

Of Massillon's sermons, then, we shall say but little more. Their finished beauty is undisputed as oratory, and they are far more known in this country than Bourdaloue's. We think, however, that it is the higher praise to be able to say, that Bourdaloue is read for real practical use by preachers, and also as a devotional writer, than that Massillon, after spending the last years of his life in polishing up his former writings, is read by all, the infidel Voltaire included. Each writer, however, has his place, as a study of oratory; and, after Bourdaloue, the graceful finish of Massillon will, if duly appreciated, add beauty to strength, and give to the student of sacred eloquence the

decorated capital that completes the classic proportion of his educational column.

But it maybe asked, Why commend to the attention of our own Church, at the present time, the preachers of the French Church, nearly two centuries ago? Would it not be better to refer at once to the primitive Fathers and our own standard divines, and then trust to good sermons being written from an earnest appreciation of abstract truth? Master minds, who are truly original in their style, may do this; but for the general improvement of English sermons,—we will not say pulpit oratory, for such a thing hardly exists,—we are sure that a model is wanted, of a more completely formed character than a general reference to the Fathers would supply. A sermon is a thing *sui generis*. It is not talk; it is not an essay; it is not a declamation; it is not a simple transfer of personal feelings from one man to others; it is not a bare howling of the animal voice, or a sedative of gentle elocution; it is not the speech of an advocate in a court of justice; neither is it at all to be compared with the oration of a statesman. It is not sufficient to begin sermon-writing with the simple intention of telling the congregation such and such things, which are thought would be useful; it is not enough to expound Scripture in general terms; it is not enough to lay down sternly the Church's laws; it is not enough to be pathetic in scenes of touching interest. A sermon requires a little of everything, dressed up with a certain degree of art and tact, and even, where attainable, dignity and elegance of style. The writing of anything, be it poetry, history, novel, essay, pamphlet, or article, presupposes a certain posture of the mind, suitable to that work and no other. No writing is only an abstract expression of thought, but is framed for a certain definite purpose, to make its appearance in a particular manner, and in certain proportions according to the space allotted. Thus it is that writers soon fall into their own line, and their own kind of work, with very little power of change, however great and original they may be in their special province. The historian will often write a dull letter, and two or three pages of his history will look much out of place in the columns of a newspaper; whilst, on the other hand, the brilliant and prolific inditer of *leaders* would be an indifferent hand at any work which occupied time and the steady retention of ideas through whole volumes of print. The mind must grasp the entire outline of an undertaking—must understand the distinctive form of its intended perfection—before it can write its component parts, or put any true energy into the very opening sentences. The same also must be said of oratory. The ideas that will pervade the mind of a speaker, and form, as it were, the atmosphere of his mind

for the time being, will always shape themselves into a form and general outline, which varies essentially according to the circumstances and nature of the speech. The habit of preparing for one kind of oration, and for one arena, often makes it difficult to prepare for another, or to put the same amount of talent into a change of scene. The mind works in certain grooves, and when habituated to one guage, loses its freedom of action, if placed in another. Those giant minds which can do everything well are superhuman and fabulous, and the nearest approaches to them generally share in the common misfortune of great size, in being also rather clumsy. Everything that a man does well is a distinct creation of his mind, and bears about it an individuality. There is no such thing as speaking or writing in the abstract, any more than there is carpentering in the abstract, apart from creating chairs or tables; and the facility which practice gives to any one branch of an art is a clear proof that a vivid realizing of the whole work on hand is necessary to any freedom of the mind in executing the parts of it during the process of construction.

A sermon, to be properly written, requires this distinctive idea of its ultimate use, to as great an extent as any other thing that has to be made. No skill in any other writing will of itself improve the effect of a sermon. Its own peculiar nature must be the only basis on which it is founded. There are many requirements also which conduce to making. sermon-writing even more an art peculiar to itself than any other literary composition. There are so many different kinds of thought, such great variety of material, such quick transition of ideas, all pressing on to overwhelm the writer, that without also some special helps, he would be indeed perplexed. A sermon is, indeed, supposed to be written in the study, like any other literary composition, for of extempore sermons we are not speaking; it is also delivered as an oration. Here, then, is a mixture of two distinct powers, which applies to no one else but preachers. No other writing is now professedly meant for recitation, nor is any other orally delivered address so avowedly written beforehand. Then, again, it is a mixture of divine and human considerations; it has to do with unseen mysteries, and with the most palpable results of human conduct. The knowledge to be displayed is partly sacred revelation, and partly the observation of most sublunary things. In part it must be simple statement of truth; in part, the imagination of the preacher must enliven attention. We expect the advocacy of the most simple faith; but also there is room for profound reasoning. Sweet and bitter pictures of human life are to be described with feeling and earnestness; yet the world is to be upheld as a fleeting shadow, about which we should

think but little. The very manner of writing and the delivery must alternate between the most deliberate enunciation of doctrine, as charged from heaven with matter far above the reach of human pathos, and, on the other hand, all the tenderness of a spiritual father, in teaching his children by direct addresses to them. Again, all this is to be done, not, as in the case of most writing and speaking, for one class of intellect, but for a mixed congregation of old and young, educated and uneducated. Such are but a few of the peculiar difficulties of sermon-writing, which prove the work to be *sui generis*. There are many helps also to relieve this burden, such as the dignity of the office, which favourably disposes an audience to respectful attention, and the solemnity of the subjects discussed, which forbids too rude criticism, as well as ensures real matter for serious contemplation, however imperfectly illustrated by the individual preacher.

Sermon writing being thus an art differing from any other kind of literary work, it follows that there ought to be special aids in acquiring some accurate knowledge of what a sermon should be, and also in learning how to carry out this knowledge is actual composition and delivery. There is the more occasion for such assistance, from the obvious fact that the preaching of sermons cannot be left only to certain gifted individuals, who by genius can work their own way or else remain silent, as may be said of political oratory, but must be exercised by a very large class of average minds. Whatever the details of such assistance might be, it is certain that models of the art will be an essential part of it; models not so far removed from the ideas of our own time as to render them deficient in practical guidance. To inspire the great mass of clergy throughout our Church with anything like the spirit of Christian oratory, will need a living school of the art, which shall both supply models and also act as a stimulant; but whether we can aim at anything like an ecclesiastical order of the oratory in our Church, or must be content with the isolated endeavours of the clergy to raise the standard of preaching in themselves, it is in both cases equally certain that the study of the great French preachers may be of infinite service. They are the very types of what is popularly understood by a sermon, and they are types not only in general character and design, but in execution also. It is often rather presumed that the modern type of sermon is the offspring of ultra-protestantism, and is calculated to supplant a due observance of the Church ritual. But how can this be said with the Church of France, during the age of Louis XIV., before us? For sixty years, during the most palmy days both of the French court and of the supremacy of the Church of Rome in France, did the people of France listen to a succession of preachers

whose names are now unrivalled for pulpit oratory, and whose sermons afford to this day so excellent a model of the art that French Protestants themselves and American Presbyterians are feign to hold them up for imitation.

The external circumstances of a sermon remain very much the same as when these men preached. They overcame all the quaintness that had preceded their time, and at once assumed the style of a highly educated clergy preaching, not missionary sermons to heathen, but practical and instructive sermons suitable to the every day life of Christians, warning against the real temptations which belong to a civilized condition of society, and exposing weaknesses which are felt at once to be those stumbling-blocks in the way of religion, which are actual and real.

There is no coarseness and rudeness to startle perhaps once, but disgust if repeated; but there is penetration and a skilful laying bare of the secret intentions of the heart, which no ordinary cloak of deception can withstand. With what perfect good taste, yet severity, does Bourdaloue, for instance, in his sermon on 'offence' for the second Sunday in Advent, address the ladies of the Court, on the dangers they put in the way of the gay and thoughtless, by courting their admiration, perhaps with no thought of harm, but only to please their vanity; he pictures the manners of gay society, the habits and customs which may pass as among the ordinary routine of high life, but which, nevertheless, he shows to be too often the cover under which a vain love of admiration may stir up ill passions in others that will be an offence to them. This kind of subject in older writers would be dealt with too quaintly (to use the mildest expression) to form a model in our own time; but in the French preachers we have the searching exposure united with such language, which, though severe and dignified, is not offensive or ridiculous to modern ears.

Before, however, making any practical suggestions for the improvement of the art of preaching in our own Church, let us review the actual position in which this art now stands; and if we find it at a low ebb we may perhaps point out some reasons and causes which may suggest a remedy.

We are no great wanderers in search of preaching; and many of the best sermons are unknown to the world, going no further than the congregations to which they are regularly addressed; but still, judging from those which are published, and from such remarks on the subject as a criticising laity will sometimes indulge in, we cannot but think that the sermons of our day are but indifferent. This is not from want of power to write, or from want of concern in the matter, but partly from external circumstances,

which almost necessitate dryness of style, and partly from the want of any real and distinct notion of what a sermon should be, that practical notion we mean which is the result of methodical study. The general complaint is that sermons are dull, that there is no life, no eloquence in them, nothing to dwell on the memory, and that they are deficient in plain teaching. Preachers are accused of going over the heads of the poor, and aiming too exclusively at educated understandings; while at the same time those more educated hearers, far from appreciating the sacrifice of others in their behalf, go home saying that Mr. So-and-So is a good sort of man, but his sermons are very dry. Occasionally, however, we do meet with instances which cannot be set down among the common-place. Some of these are really good and impressive, and thus claim a meritorious distinction; but many more are conspicuous, not for anything better than simple dryness, but for ill-judged vulgar eccentricity, for self-conceit, nay, for false doctrine and heresy. A bold preacher generally means an arrogant, self-opinionated, ill-read man, whose boldness consists in defying the rules and feelings of his Church, or even the essential doctrines of religion. How seldom do we meet with a bold impressive sermon, that also bears the mark of the educated scholar, the well-read theologian, and the man of acute feelings and sensitive taste! Yet there are clergy of our Church, who are well-educated and well-read, and men of good taste in the affairs of life. There is material among us for a very good performance of any duties required from them as a class of educated men. We are therefore disposed to think that there is specific failing in their pulpit eloquence; and that they could do better if circumstances had brought out their real powers for this purpose. Why is it that sermons are so connected with sleep, and that drowsiness is the inevitable consequence of a few minutes' session under a pulpit? With eagerness do people follow after an orator where he is to be found;—with pleasure will they sacrifice their time and convenience to hear a good speech in a court of justice from some clever member of the bar, and amid crowd and heat the time flies away, so that at the end of an hour they seem only to have just got well into the subject, and are braced up for any further length which they may be called upon to hear;—with breathless silence will the House of Commons and a few lucky possessors of strangers' seats, be absorbed in a speech of hours' duration. The introduction of a budget has on two recent occasions occupied five or six hours, while not only a house crowded to suffocation has fairly shown its power of outlasting the physical endurance of the orator; but the very purlieux and lobbies have been filled, as if the mere proximity to

eloquence were of itself a pleasing sensation. But when the Sunday sermons arrive, how great the difference! In ten minutes there seems to have been enough of it. After that all is maze and confusion, between an ill-regulated manner of marking out his subject on the part of the preacher, increased by a droning mere reading delivery, and of a wandering sleepiness on the part of the listener. Should the whole exceed half-an-hour there is obvious impatience, as if an unjust punishment was being inflicted. We have heard that it is avowed by a celebrated statesman, one whose head has been severely tested by many labours, that he can get through all he has to do with patient endurance, except the hearing of sermons, which, nevertheless, he feels it his duty to submit to; nor, it may be right to remark, do we here refer to any kind of unpleasantness but that of being bored by unprofitable and unsatisfactory discourses. How few of our bishops can preach even respectably, with the exception of those who are worked to death to make up for the inability of others! There are popular preachers, run after by some, but, as we said before, there is an element of bad taste about most of the present day, which only the more proves what we would wish to substantiate, that there is great need in the education of our clergy of some means to train up, in good taste and in something like method, those who may have a natural power of language.

What are the causes, then, which, in a well-educated clergy like our own, depress that development of a good and true eloquence which might naturally be expected? Some of these causes may be unavoidable, and so far there results must be endured; but let us at any rate know them.

The much talked of perfection of the parochial system must, we fear, bear part of the blame. According to it the whole country is most usefully parcelled out into certain managable districts, over which an Incumbent presides, whose province it is generally supposed to be twofold; firstly, to do certain work himself, or obtain the assistance of assistant clergy in the shape of Curates to do it for him; and, secondly, to watch with jealous eye against the intrusion of any one else within his boundary. No other functions are recognised in our Church, no other licences are given, but in connexion with the parochial system. The Incumbent then, once in his parish, remains the sole dispenser of all Christian ministrations for perhaps his whole life, among which ministrations the custom of the age requires that he shall preach two sermons every Sunday of a respectable given length, to the same congregation. Whether he has any vocation for eloquence or not, that makes no difference; he may have been presented to his living for considerations far

different from such as would promise oratory; but, however incapable, he is nevertheless bound to the inevitable law of certain fixed sermons. This extreme uniformity in the exactions from every clergyman, be his vocation what it may, is of itself depressing to the general standard. It follows from it that a sermon ceases to be a real address from priest to people, and is looked upon by church-going people as but a form to be gone through, utterly regardless of the idea that they are being told of something which they must therefore do. A clergyman who ventures for once to give plain advice, or who endeavours to rouse his people, discovers that his words are lost in the very multitude of his sermons, many of which perhaps have been preached, less perhaps because he was conscious of anything that he wished to say, than because he was obliged to mount the pulpit. The number of sermons to be preached often outsteps all power of composition, and suggests the reading of those which are neither original nor new. On the other hand, the congregation, from hearing sermons so methodically and frequently, lose their relish and appreciation for really stirring addresses, and even dislike the worry and excitement occasioned by them. Anything that is a departure from the quietness of the Sunday, that occasions talk or risks controversy, is thought an innovation on their peace, and a preacher is a fanatic who will not allow his congregation to slumber through his discourses. It thus follows that quiet clergymen, who are personal friends with their flock, who visit their houses, and dine with the respectable families, who are mixed up with them in many secular affairs, become so overladen with a variety of quieting considerations, and are so void of foreign stimulus, that they are never able to command that freshness and vigour which are the requisite state of mind for a preacher to be useful and impressive. A clergyman's intercourse with his people, according to present custom, is only of that kind which rather weighs down his character as a preacher, and he has but little of that other kind of intercourse which admits him into the recesses of their hearts, and opens out a mutual confidence in spiritual affairs. He is good-naturedly received as a friend, and in that intercourse is led into the common familiarities of life, but he is not supposed to counteract the secular impressions by an inward knowledge of the hearts of his flock, and by the sobering effect on himself, which the sensation of being truly the physician to each individual soul would occasion. These remarks apply to the younger clergy in the first instance, but the style of preaching, being formed under the influence of these somewhat depressing causes, remains the same ever afterwards, and can never be shaken off. Here indeed is a great cause of the dulness we

allude to: that clergy begin to preach at once, with the same regularity that will be required of them all through their ministry. Thus the delivery of sermons is never, except in a few of the larger metropolitan or country-town churches, associated with a gradually-inspired confidence, either on the part of the congregation or of ecclesiastical superiors. The exclusiveness, again, with which all religious functions in each parish are isolated, as it were, from the rest of the Christian world, and by the absence of common ties, by which parts of the same Church may hold common cause with many brethren, is a means of preventing many mutual interchanges of Christian friendship, both in priest and people, which might stimulate and encourage both to their mutual advantage. It is hard to keep up a sound and useful course of sermons, when the preacher and people are both mixed up in the affairs of daily life which mark the limits of one small parish, when two sermons have to be preached every Sunday, and when there are no opportunities of infusing fresh life, by occasional changes on the part of each. Yet such is our present system. How it might be otherwise we shall presently suggest, and meanwhile go on with our review of hindering causes.

The services of our Church are too long, especially the morning accumulation, for the sermon to have any fair chance. The inseparable connexion also between all sermons and the ritual of the Church, which prohibits any preaching except as following morning or evening prayers; or, on the other hand, any prayers but when followed by a sermon, is a great bar to the formation of what otherwise might be attractive occasions for assembling people together; at which, with some degree of freedom, a clergyman might address them rather for the purpose of *bringing* them to the Church's prayers and ordinances, than only on the condition of their being already attendants. The arrangement of churches, where the pew system is carried, is also detrimental to the warmth of preachers, inasmuch as it scatters his flock far and wide, contrary to all instincts which bring listeners together in one compact body round the speaker who is addressing. There are also no opportunities of preaching to different classes by themselves. Each congregation is composed of the same elements, rich and poor, young and old. It might surely be useful if occasional separation could be brought by some natural process, wherein each consulted his own convenience, in order that practical advice might be given to every condition of life, without that irritation which is often the consequence of one class being too closely lectured in presence of others, or without the miserable expedient of *ragged churches*. In fact, what we are wishing to advocate amounts to this; that

churches and services may acquire a greater freedom, may be open to all occasions, and under a greater variety of circumstance than our present rigid laws of uniformity permit of.

A great practical deficiency, however, in our Church is the almost entire absence of any training in composition and delivery, having the pulpit especially in view. There are no schools of oratory at the Universities; no college of preachers under the sanction of ecclesiastical authority, like the different orders of Oratorians that have at various times and places adopted this work as their peculiar mission; and there are also no institutions in each diocese, having for their object the encouragement of sound Christian oratory, either by means of direct instruction, preparatory, and even subsequent to orders; or by means of supplying living examples and models; if such we might call good preachers, who, known also for their solid attainments and high character, might in many ways be a stimulus to the parochial clergy. We might swell out the list of impediments to eloquence much further, but we have said enough for practical purposes, and now we shall briefly suggest such remedies as seem to us not wholly visionary or impossible.

The feeling that some stimulus is required in the way of preaching is so general, that some have advocated out-of-door or street preaching. This is not the line we would take. If any clergymen feel that they can do real good by this plan, and if, in the execution of it, they can avoid any unpleasant contact with the police, and can preserve order, let them do it. This must be, however, on their own responsibility; and, for ourselves, we should prefer a systematized reformation of the present state of things, to such a foreign appendix. This climate is not suited to out-of-door preaching, at least for any great portion of the year; and as long as we have or can obtain churches, well covered in and proof against the elements, we see no reason for leaving them empty, whilst we stand outside in the wet and cold. The primeval use and intention of churches is to cover priest and people during the time of preaching, among other acts of religion; and the open air system is, to say the least of it, barbarous, as well as specifically inconvenient to delicate lungs. The policy of Churchmen should be to strive for a legitimate revival of the system which we inherit, and a real and energetic use of the whole machinery which is given to us. Where it appears inoperative, and clogged with difficulties, let us at any rate turn our attention to the task of obtaining greater freedom of action, and of cleansing away nuisances, before we leave it to itself, and establish ways and means of an external character.

To put new life into any system, or, indeed, to maintain its

efficiency at any time, it is of course, in the first place, essential to have a living government, with discretionary power to authorize arrangements. A mere statute-book Church, void of any such living and responsible authority, will inevitably fail in practical work. Let there be some power, then, to authorize, especially in large town churches and cathedrals, set preachings, with a few hymns and collects, as at the Universities, distinct from the present regular services. Let sermons be preached at times of the day which suit different classes of society, and different ages, so that occasionally, at any rate, each class may have counsel freely given to them, in plain terms, without the hindrance of others being present who might check the preacher's liberty. Let the several ordinances of the Church, as catechising, confirmation, preparation for communion,—or again, in more secular matters, the anniversaries of clubs and societies,—all be occasions of varying the monotony of our beaten track in sermon writing, by addressing those present on their distinctive duties or failings. Let the Bishop of each diocese, where practicable, preach in his churches occasionally, stirring up by his zeal both pastor and flock to renewed diligence and good-will. Let him also appoint the dean, canons of his cathedral, and others, to preach in the churches of his diocese, as ordered in the 'Constitution and Canons Ecclesiastical:' especially let this be done during the seasons of Lent and Advent. These seasons, well attended to as occasions for solemn preaching, would stimulate, twice a-year, the quiet monotony of parochial sermons. Let the naves of cathedrals be open to catch even passers-by in the streets of a city, as places where the voice of religion is to be heard, free and open to all who even casually would look in. Many who thus came even to 'scoff, might remain to pray.' How inaccessible is the preaching of our cathedrals, at present, to the poor and ignorant! Unconnected, however, with the ritual of the choir, we cannot but think that multitudes might be drawn in to hear words of persuasion from powerful, eloquent preachers, holding forth in the naves. Let the bodies, also, of large churches be used in the same manner, clearing away for the time the whole principle of appropriated seats. Let no prejudices exist either against a layman for hearing a sermon in another parish, or against the visit of an appointed preacher sent by the Bishop, with the Incumbent's consent, at the solemn seasons of the Church, into a parochial pulpit. In extreme cases, the rights of an Incumbent would preserve him from annoyance; and this is no more than is implied by the Canons, in ordering licensed preachers to be called in where the Curate of the parish is not so licensed; or than is yearly carried out in the Lent preachers appointed by the Bishop of London in his diocese. Many of these arrangements could only, perhaps, be carried

out in large towns; but, as it happens in them that some reformatory system is most needed, we might well be contented even if the example was not copied in rural districts, where the appointment, for instance, of Advent or Lent preachers would be a matter of difficulty and inconvenience.

But, to ensure good preachers, the Church must retain in her service men of power, of talent, of sound theological education, and of general high character. She must first educate them in the science of oratory; and having done so, she must not let all her high places and emoluments be disposed of for party and private ends, or for barter and simoniacal dealing: she must not do this, while all young men of talent and promise are brought up in other professions. She must so manage her worldly estate, that it may redound to her true efficiency. It might be aiming too high to have a Metropolitan College of Oratorians — men solely devoted to the work of preaching, and the study necessary for it; but the Training College for Orders, which we hope will soon be found in every diocese, should do much, under the direction of the Bishop and his officers, towards assisting in their studies those who, in a short time, will have to be preachers throughout the diocese. These institutions, if near the cathedral, might derive much advantage from that free use of the naves, which we have mentioned, for the purpose of attractive sermons. An example would thus remain in the recollection of the young student, which might long be a stimulus to his own exertions. At any rate the young ecclesiastic would not go to his parish, having had these things before him, without a strong sense of the necessity that lay on himself to use labour and care in the preparation of his sermons, and also to observe good taste and scholar-like habits, together with boldness and freedom, in their composition and delivery. To statesmen who have high patronage in their gift, we would strongly commend their duty of exercising it in such a way as may promote these ends. Bishops, deans, canons, and others, ought, by their office, to be the very men we have described,— public men, who can do their part before the world with zeal and ability. And if, to rise in political life, it is essential to possess powers of oratory, surely it is also needed, in ecclesiastical dignitaries, that at any rate a fair proportion should be so far eloquent, as to be impressive and sound Christian preachers. We are not without good hope for the future, from recent appointments in the Colonies, and with all due encouragement from statesmen, and from other members of the Church in their several vocations and ministries, we have that confidence in the powers and the earnestness of the main body of our rising clergy, that we look forward to another Augustan age of Christian oratory, to other Bossuets, to other Bourdaloues, and to other Massillons.

ART. IV.—*Some Account of the Council of Nicæa in connexion with the Life of Athanasius. By* JOHN KAYE, D.D., Lord Bishop of Lincoln. London: Rivingtons. 1853.

THE above work may be regarded as a legacy bequeathed to the Church by the learned and excellent prelate whose name it bears. The lamented death of the author has not only delayed its appearance, but has sent it into the world devoid of his own final revision. An Appendix, which the publishers had been led to expect would be found among his papers, has not appeared; and it is therefore concluded that Bishop Kaye had either abandoned his intention of forming one, or had not found leisure to carry it into effect. Prefixed to the whole is a short preface, which has been revised by his intimate and learned friend, the Rev. J. A. Jeremie, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge.

Bishop Kaye's work consists of three parts,—1st, that entitled, 'Account of the Council of Nicæa;' which, in fact, contains a history of the whole Arian heresy, from its rise to the death of Athanasius: 2dly, 'A digest of the four Orations of Athanasius against the Arians;' in which the author considers at length the arguments brought against the Christian and Catholic faith by those heretics, and their answer by S. Athanasius: and lastly, 'Some account of the tract De Incarnatione Christi;' an independent piece of that Father's, composed before the commencement of the schism.

We consider this work as a decided acquisition to the library of Theological students, that class for whom the author more immediately designed it. The great doctrine of which it treats, that of the Godhead of Jesus Christ our blessed Lord and Saviour, does in truth form the very foundation of the whole Christian faith, and is that on which the question of man's redemption must inevitably depend. Yet, vitally important as the subject is, we have scarcely any standard work on it, the mastery of which does not require more time and labour than most even of the Clergy, especially those in large towns, have to give. Bishop Bull's Defensio, of inestimable value as it is, deters the majority of readers by its length, and daunts them by its language. The style of Barrow is alone enough to repel any but the most resolute and persevering. Dr. Newman's elaborate and valuable work on the Arians

requires the reader to bring to its perusal a competent knowledge of the chief heathen schools of philosophy, added to an accurate and extensive acquaintance with the great doctrinal questions which had agitated the Church, previously to the time of Arius, and it is therefore of comparatively little benefit to the general student. It is besides, and has long been, unattainable, from its scarcity in the market. The translations from the works of S. Athanasius, in the Library of the Fathers, scarcely do more than prove that the doctrinal writings of that great champion of Christendom cannot be formally transferred from their own language without losing much, not only of their interest and spirit, but even of their primary force and significance.

Here, then, Bishop Kaye appears to us to step in with a very valuable work. In a volume, of which one, not the least, recommendation is, that it is not too lengthy or laborious, but is within at once the intellectual grasp and the pecuniary reach of every one who has a real desire to make himself acquainted with its subject, the author has depicted, with the utmost care, the history of the Church, during perhaps the most momentous period of her existence; and has represented, with the most scrupulous fidelity, the arguments both of Arius and his followers in support of their heresy, and of their great opponent, S. Athanasius, in its confutation. Bishop Kaye has approached his subject with his own clearness and acuteness; and to abundance of original learning he has added ample means, in the shape of references and foot notes, by which the reader may, if he please, further instruct himself. He shows throughout a keen appreciation of the true doctrine, in the enunciation of which, as we need scarcely say, he is to be most fully trusted. We cannot, indeed, avoid expressing a wish that we could discover in his pages something of that animation and fervour of which his subject is so preeminently worthy, and which Bishop Bull has shown it to be so capable of inspiring, when approached with a becoming sense of its deep importance. As it is, we fear that his style may tend to chill the feelings, and damp the interest of the reader. The author seems scarcely to have realized the full weight of his character and position. The lightest word of an aged and learned Bishop would come with incalculable weight on such a subject; and there are occasions on which even gentleness and forbearance are so greatly out of place, as almost to suffer change in their very nature. We would, however, say less on this point, because, in addition to the trite rule of 'De mortuis nil nisi bonum,' the present work presents a favourable contrast, in this respect, to some of its author's earlier productions.

Bishop Kaye commences with a narration of the rise of the Arian heresy, in which he places before us the accounts of that event given respectively by Socrates and Sozomen; historians whose statements it has been too much the custom of theological writers to contrast, instead of attempting, as they might, to reconcile them with each other. The former lays the real blame of the whole dispute and division on Arius alone. He 'says that as Alexander was speaking one day, in the 'presence of the Presbytery and the other Clergy, somewhat 'too boldly on the great Mystery of the Unity in Trinity, 'Arius, imagining that he was introducing the doctrine of 'Sabellius, immediately contradicted him; and, actuated by 'a love of contention, proceeded to lay down a scheme of his 'own, in which, arguing from human things to Divine, he main-'tained, that if God the Father begat God the Son, it is plain that 'the latter had a beginning of existence, and that there was a 'time when He was not; from which it also results, that He had 'his existence from nothing.' Or, as Bishop Kaye forcibly says, 'In other words, He was a created being made out of things that 'were not.' Socrates goes on to say that the heresy soon spread through the whole of Egypt, Libya, and the Upper Thebes, and at length diffused itself over the rest of the provinces and cities; and that Alexander, finding how widely the evil had extended, thereupon, in much anger, called a council of many Bishops, in which Arius and his supporters were formally excommunicated.

The relation of Sozomen differs but slightly from this of Socrates. He tells us that Arius had been at first a zealous defender of the faith, but had, at the same time, upheld the innovations of the schismatical Meletius, on abandoning whom, he was ordained deacon by Peter, then Bishop of Alexandria, but was soon after excommunicated by that prelate, for condemning his rejection of the Meletian baptism. Having asked pardon for his offence, he was restored to communion and to the exercise of his office, by Achillas, and by him eventually promoted to the priesthood, Alexander himself holding him in high repute, until he presumed to teach those opinions of which no one had ever before heard. According to this historian, Alexander was accused by some of supineness for not interposing authoritatively on the first broaching of his heresy by Arius, and putting a stop to novelties which seemed to be opposed to the faith; but he himself thought it better, if possible, to obtain unanimity of opinion by persuasion, than to compel it by force. He therefore suffered the question to be freely debated by the Clergy; and when a first council could arrive at no decisive conclusion, he assembled a second, in which, after some hesitation, applauding, says Sozomen, now the one side and now the other,

he finally decided in favour of those who held that the Son was co-essential and co-eternal with the Father, and commanded Arius to receive the same doctrine. And on the heresiarch refusing to retract his former statements, he excommunicated him and such of the Clergy as supported him. It would seem that there is no real difference of statement in these two historians, and that their accounts may be easily harmonized; the apparent variation arising only from the fact that the account of Sozomen is more exact and ample than that of Socrates.

The immediate result of this necessary act on the part of Alexander was, that Arius forthwith proceeded to array his forces for a formal contest with his Bishop. He wrote to Eusebius, Bishop of Nicomedia, to whom he stated his belief that 'the Son was not ingenerate, nor in any respect a part of 'the Ingenerate, nor from any subject matter, but from things 'which were not. He subsisted by the will and counsel (of 'the Father) before all times and ages, Perfect God, Only 'begotten, Unchangeable; and He was not, before He was 'begotten, or created, or predestined, or founded.' Eusebius expressed his perfect approbation of this doctrine, saying, that what was made could not be before it was made, and must have a beginning of existence.[1] Alexander, on his part, sent to other Bishops and Metropolitans, to notify the heresy for which Arius had been condemned, and to caution them against receiving him into communion. Of the many letters which he wrote, that addressed to his namesake of Constantinople, and an encyclical epistle, have come down to us: in the former, 'he describes the Arians,' to use Bishop Kaye's words, 'as selecting those passages of Scripture which speak 'of the humiliation of Christ, and passing over those which 'declare His Godhead; thus insidiously instilling their opinions 'into the minds of those who frequented their assemblies. 'Ebion, he says, Artemas, and Paul of Samosata, were the fore-'runners of Arius; but he derived his doctrine immediately 'from Lucian, who had adopted the cause of Paul, and had 'remained out of the communion of the Church during the in-'cumbency of three successive Bishops of Antioch.' Alexander adds, that three Syrian Bishops, supposed by Valesius to be Eusebius of Cæsarea, Theodotus, and Paulinus, had espoused the cause of Arius, and confirmed him in his error.[2]

The exact order of events that followed, it is now scarcely possible to ascertain: it seems, however, certain that Arius soon after left Alexandria, and betook himself to Palestine, and

[1] Athanasius, De Synodis, § 17; Kaye, p. 7.
[2] And see Theodoret, Hist. Book i. chap. 3.

that from Nicomedia he wrote to Alexander, but in a strain which did not at all tend to heal the breach. He terms the Son 'a perfect creature of God, but not as one of the creatures; an offspring, but not as one of those who are generated.' He now also composed his 'Thalia,' which exhibits statements, if possible, still more shocking and detestable. A council was soon after summoned by Eusebius, Bishop of Nicomedia, and his partisans in Bithynia,[1] from which they wrote, as Sozomen says, 'to the Bishops in all places' to hold communion with him. In reply to this, a third council appears to have been held at Alexandria, in which Arius was a second time formally excommunicated by Alexander, with the concurrence of nearly one hundred Bishops, and in which, as would seem, the encyclical letter, of which Socrates gives a copy, was written. The chief substance of this letter is thus given by Bishop Kaye:—

'They affirmed that God was not always a Father: that there was a time when He was not a Father: that the Word of God did not always exist, but was made out of things which were not. The self-existing God having made Him who was not out of things which were not, there was consequently a time when He did not exist. The Son is a Being created and made; neither is He like in essence to the Father; nor the true Word of the Father by nature, nor His true Wisdom, but one of the things made and generated. The titles "Word and Wisdom" are improperly applied to Him, inasmuch as He Himself was made by the proper Word (or Reason) of God, and by the Wisdom in God, in which God made both Him and all things. He is, therefore, by nature liable to change, like all other rational creatures. The Word is also extraneous to and separate from the essence of God. Moreover, the Father is ineffable by the Son; for the Son neither perfectly nor accurately knows the Father, nor can perfectly see Him. The Son does not even know His own essence as it is; for He was made for our sakes, that God might use Him as an instrument in creating us: He would not have subsisted if God had not thought fit to create us. The Arians do not appear to have shrunk from the consequences of their opinions; for, when asked whether the Word of God might be perverted as the devil was, they answered in the affirmative, since He is by nature liable to change.

'We learn from the letter not only the tenets of Arius, but also the manner in which Alexander refuted them by appealing to Scripture.

'To the assertion that there was a time when the Word was not, Alexander opposed John i. 1: "In the beginning was the Word."

'To the assertion that the Son was one of the things made, the title of Only-Begotten, and the declaration of S. John i. 3, that all things were made by Him. He who was the Maker could not be on a level with the things which He made, nor could He who was the Only-Begotten be numbered with them.

'To the assertion that the Word of God was made from things that were not, Alexander opposed Psalms xlv. 1; cx. 3.

'To the assertion that the Son is unlike in essence to the Father, Colossians i. 15, where the Son is called the image; and Hebrews i. 3, where He is called the radiance of the glory of the Father; and John xiv. 9, where Christ says to Philip, "He who hath seen Me, hath seen the Father."

[1] Sozomen, i. 15; Fleury, book x. § 37.

'How,' Alexander asks, 'if the Son is the Word, or Reason, and Wisdom of God, can it be said that there was a time when He was not? for that were to say that God was then without the Word or Reason (ἄλογος), and without Wisdom. How can He be liable to variation or change, Who says of Himself, "I am in the Father and the Father in me" (John xiv. 10); and "I and the Father are One" (John x. 30); and of whom it is said by the Prophet, "I am, and I change not?" Alexander refers also to Hebrews xiii. 8, 'Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever.'

'To the assertion that the Son was made for us, Alexander opposes 1 Cor. viii. 6, where St. Paul says that all things are by Him; and to the assertion that He did not perfectly know the Father, the declaration of Christ himself (John x. 15): 'As the Father knoweth Me, even so know I the Father.' If the Son's knowledge of the Father is imperfect, so must also be the Father's knowledge of the Son; such is the impiety to which the assertions of Arius lead.'—Pp. 10—13.

In consequence, probably, of this letter, certain Bishops of Palestine finding Alexander firm in his rejection of the heresiarch, came together, and gave him and his adherents permission to assemble the people who were their followers in church (ἐκκλησιάζειν), on condition that they submitted to Alexander, and endeavoured to be restored to peace and communion with him. One of these Bishops was Eusebius of Cæsarea, the historian, of whom we now first hear as an active partisan of Arius.

Affairs remained in this position until Constantine, after the defeat of Licinius, A. D. 324, desiring the aid of the Bishops of the East, of which in the time of Constantine Egypt was reckoned a part, to put an end to the Donatist schism, and finding that they themselves were in a state of division, sent Hosius to Alexandria with a letter addressed jointly to Alexander and Arius, entreating them to terminate their differences, and restore to him his former peace. A council was held at Alexandria, but the efforts of Hosius met with no success, and he was compelled to return to Constantine at Nicomedia, without having been able to decide either the Arian or any of the minor questions which he had been despatched to settle.

Constantine now determined to refer the matter to a General Council; and in consequence, in the year 325, upwards of three hundred Bishops met from every country at the city of Nicæa in Bithynia. Bishop Kaye and other historians have given an account of the acts of the Council, and the deeds of the Emperor, and we shall therefore confine ourselves to the narration of such of their proceedings which have come down to us as have regard to the great doctrinal question then at issue. In these, S. Athanasius, then one of the Deacons of S. Alexander, bore the chief part. He, although only yet in his diaconate, was seated, as S. Gregory Nazianzen tells us, in the first place

of the assembly, and his chief opponents were Eusebius of Nicomedia, Theognis of Nice, and Maris of Chalcedon.[1]

The Arians, as we are informed by S. Athanasius, 'were 'asked by the bishops with gentleness and humanity to give a 'reason for, and proofs of their assertions; but as soon as they 'began to speak they convicted themselves, for they contradicted 'each other, and were quickly reduced to silence, by which the 'turpitude of their heresy stood confessed. They were not 'ashamed to say that the Son was not in time before He was 'begotten, and even He was made from nothing (ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων), 'and hence the Father was not always a father, but when the 'Son was created and made, then God was called his Father; 'for the Word is a creature and a work, and strange to, and 'unlike the Father in essence.'[2]

Now, too, they openly broached their doctrine, that Christ was not the true Wisdom and Word of God, saying, according to the same authority, 'The Son was not by nature the true 'Word of the Father, nor His only and true Wisdom; but, 'being a creature, and one of the things made, He is improperly 'called Word and Wisdom, for even He was created, like all 'things, by the Word which was in God; for the same reason, 'also, He is not very God.'[3] Of the particular reasonings and discussions by which the Fathers of the Council refuted these monstrous and most wicked assertions we are unhappily ignorant, but the documents by which their authors attempted to support them were chiefly the following:—

1. A letter of Eusebius of Nicomedia, mentioned by S. Ambrose, who gives a short extract from it in his work De Fide, book iii. chap. 15, in which it is said, that 'if we call the Son of 'God true God, and uncreate, we confess Him to be of one 'substance with the Father' (ὁμοούσιος); an admission which, according to S. Ambrose, was the actual cause of the term ὁμοούσιος being introduced into the creed, namely, to use his own words, 'ut tanquam evaginato ab ipsis gladio, caput hæreseos amputarent.' From the close resemblance of the statements in this letter to the one which Eusebius addressed to Paulinus of Tyre previously to the Council, of which Theodoret has given a copy in the 6th chapter of the 1st book of his history, Fleury supposes that they may have been one and the same.

2. A document, if indeed it be not the letter last mentioned, offered by certain Arians, and referred to by Theodoret, Hist. i. 7, as πιστέως διδασκαλία, and, as it would appear, by Eustathius of Antioch, [quoted ib. chap. 8,] as τὸ γράμμα τῆς Εὐσεβίου

[1] And see Socrates, i. 8.
[2] S. Athanasius, Nic. Def. § 3.
[3] S. Gregory, Orat. 21; cited by Tillemont, History of the Council of Nice, § 8.

βλασφημίας, both of whom state it to have been torn in pieces by the Council as soon as read.

A question of some moment is connected with this document, involving in a great degree the credit and orthodoxy of Eusebius of Cæsarea. Tillemont and Valesius think it to be the creed which that Bishop offered, as we know from his letter to the people of his See, to the Council, and which he says the Emperor received as orthodox, and exhorted all to assent to and subscribe, with the addition merely of the term 'of one substance.' If the above historians are correct, it is clear that Eusebius is guilty on the one hand of flagrant heresy, (for Eustathius says that 'its perversion caused immeasurable grief to the hearers, and irremediable shame to its author,') and, on the other hand, that in his account of its reception he has committed one of the most gross and palpable falsehoods recorded in history of a Christian Bishop.

Tillemont founds his opinion on the words of S. Athanasius, (§ 3, De Decret. Syn. Nic.) that the Council rejected the Eusebian statements, ἀνέλοντες ῥήματα, which however, as he half admits, do not bear him out in his opinion that Athanasius meant by these words to refer to the creed of Eusebius of Cæsarea, or that his creed was so destroyed.

Valesius, in his notes on Theodoret's seventh and eighth chapters, takes the γράμμα Εὐσεβίου of Eustathius to mean the *Creed* of Eusebius, as γράμμα is undoubtedly used by him soon after of the *Creed* of Nicæa, and from the accusation of Eusebius of Cæsarea by Eustathius [reported by Socrates, i. 23 (ad fin.)], of having depraved that creed, he concludes that the Eusebius mentioned by him in Theodoret was the Bishop of Cæsarea, rather than his namesake of Nicomedia.

But, 1st, although γράμμα may mean 'creed' in one instance, there is no necessity that it should do so in another; and, 2dly, it is plain that there is no such connexion between the two passages of Eustathius as Valesius contends for, and as would compel us to his conclusion. We should remember, too, that Eusebius denied the charge brought against him by Eustathius; which it is impossible to imagine that he could have done had he been publicly known as the author of doctrines so ignominiously repudiated by the Council: nor can we suppose that in this case Eustathius, who had suffered so much at his hands, and the hands of his party,[1] and was in consequence his determined enemy, would, by confining his accusation to Eusebius's perversion of the Nicene Creed, have lost the opportunity of striking what must have proved a fatal blow to his reputation.

[1] Theodoret, Hist. i. 21.

But, to put the matter beyond doubt, the creed of Eusebius is extant; and it is certain that the terms in which Eustathius describes the torn document are wholly inapplicable to it; 'there being nothing in that confession,' to use the words of Cave, 'that deserves so bad a character—nothing that savours either of heresy or blasphemy.' Indeed, we will say more even than this; we will put his creed side by side with that of the Council, and our readers will then see that the two are almost one and the same, the only material difference between them consisting of the addition of the words ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας and ὁμοούσιος in the latter; and, therefore, that Eusebius's account of its reception is strictly true: from which it surely follows that the Fathers of the Council could not have stopped their ears against as blasphemous, and torn as heretical, a creed which so evidently formed the groundwork of their own.

CREED OF THE COUNCIL.

Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἑνὰ Θεὸν, Πατέρα παντοκράτορα, πάντων ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀορατῶν ποιητήν· καὶ εἰς ἑνὰ Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς μονογενῆ, τουτέστιν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρὸς· Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ, φῶς ἐκ φωτὸς, Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα, ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρί. Δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, τά τε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ· τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα, καὶ σαρκωθέντα, καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα· παθόντα, καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τριτῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐράνους· ἐρχόμενον κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς. Καὶ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον. Τοὺς δὲ λέγοντας· ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν, καὶ πρὶν γεννηθῆναι οὐκ ἦν, καὶ ὅτε ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐγένετο ἢ ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως ἢ οὐσίας φάσκοντας εἶναι ἢ τρεπτὸν, ἢ ἀλλοιωτὸν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τούτους ἀναθεματίζει ἡ ἁγία καθολικὴ καὶ ἀποστολικὴ ἐκκλησία.—*S. Athanas., de Decret. Syn. Nic. Appendix* § 4; *Socrates, i.* 8; *Theodoret i.* 12.

CREED OF EUSEBIUS.

Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἑνα Θεὸν, Πατέρα παντοκράτορα, καὶ τῶν ἁπάντων ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀορατῶν ποιητήν· καὶ εἰς ἑνὰ Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγον, Θεὸν ἐκ τοῦ Θεου, φῶς ἐκ φωτὸς, ζωὴν ἐκ ζωῆς, Υἱὸν μονογενῆ, πρωτότοκον πάσης τῆς κτίσεως, πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων, ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς γεγεννημένον.[1] δι' οὗ καὶ ἐγένετο πάντα· τὸν διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν σαρκωθέντα καὶ ἐν ἀνθρώποις πολιτευσάμενον, καὶ παθόντα καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τριτῇ ἡμέρᾳ, καὶ ἀνελθόντα πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα, καὶ ἥξοντα πάλιν ἐν δόξῃ κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς. Πιστεύομεν καὶ εἰς ἓν Πνεῦμα ἅγιον, τούτων ἕκαστον εἶναι καὶ ὑπάρχειν πιστεύοντες, Πατέρα ἀληθινῶς Πατέρα, καὶ Υἱὸν ἀληθινῶς υἱὸν, Πνεῦμα τε ἅγιον ἀληθινῶς Πνεῦμα ἅγιον, καθὰ καὶ ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν ἀποστέλλων εἰς τὸ κήρυγμα τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ μαθητὰς, εἶπε· πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος. κ.τ.λ. —*Socrates, i.* 8; *Theodoret, i.* 12; *S. Athan. de Decret. Syn. Nic. Appendix* § 3.

In fact, the γράμμα Εὐσεβίου βλασφημίας of Eustathius may very well refer to the 'Epistola Eusebii Nicomediensis' of S. Ambrose; a supposition which is strengthened by the facts, that its description by the former exactly coincides with

[1] Theodoret, ap. Schulze, reads less correctly γεγενημένον.

the extract from it of the latter; and, that that extract not only bears, as our readers will have seen, no manner of resemblance to anything found in the creed of Eusebius of Cæsarea, but in fact expresses a doctrine on the Son totally different from that contained in the latter formula. Certain it is that the document mentioned by S. Ambrose cannot have been a formal creed; for, as his Benedictine Editors see, he expressly terms it Epistola.[1]

We will venture to offer another and a final reason for considering the torn document to have been the production of the Bishop of Nicomedia or his partisans. Eustathius, in the eighth chapter of Theodoret, already referred to, describes the party from which it proceeded as *οἱ ἀμφὶ τὸν Εὐσέβιον*, a mode of expression which seems to us to have been intended to convey to the mind of the reader the fact that the Eusebius there mentioned was not the Bishop of Cæsarea, but of Nicomedia; for it was the latter, and not the former, who proved their most active correspondent,[2] and most resolute champion.[3] It was he who took the lead among them on all occasions, and from whom they were often named, (*e. g.* by S. Athanasius continually, and by S. Ambrose in the passage cited above, who calls him 'Auctor eorum,') whose position too as the Bishop of a city which, since the days of Diocletian, had been a royal residence, gave him more power to promote the heresy, and to annoy the Church, than was possessed by any other of the faction. To him also, through abuse of the influence which he possessed over the Emperor, is to be ascribed the renovation of the heresy after its condemnation at Nicæa, together with the ceaseless attempts of Arius to be restored to communion, and the endless insults and injuries heaped on the head of S. Athanasius, for no other crime than that of refusing, as was his plain duty as the heresiarch's Bishop, to receive him. In a word, it was he, and not his namesake of Cæsarea, who was *the* Eusebius of the party, the mainstay of the cause, the state champion of the whole heresy.

We conclude, therefore, that the document torn by the

[1] The note of the Benedictines on this passage of S. Ambrose is sufficiently in favour of the view which we have here taken to induce us to make from it an extract of some length: 'Ambigitur inter eruditos quænam sit illa Euseb. Nic. Epistola, cujus mentio fit ab Ambrosio. Hermanus, lib. ii. vitæ Sti. Athii. cap. 8, post Cardinalem Baronium ad annum 325 putat eam esse cujus Theodoretus, lib. i. cap. 8, edit. Valesii commeminit. Valesius vero in eundem locum non de Epistola Nicomediensis, sed de libello fidei ab Euseb. Cæsar. patribus concilii oblato, hunc Theodoreti locum defendit, allatis in hanc rem quibusdam rationibus, quæ sane tanti non videntur ut ejus opinio omni careat difficultate. Verum quicquid sit, certum est Ambrosium non de formula seu libello fidei, sed de Epistola hoc loco loqui.'—De Fide, iii. 15.

[2] Socrates, i. 15.

[3] Socrates, i. 6; Sozomen, ii. 22.

Council was the letter of Eusebius of Nicomedia; or, if a creed, that it was one which emanated from the faction of which he was the head, and was not that of the Bishop of Cæsarea: and, in consequence, that whatever else the latter is to be charged with in this controversy, he was guiltless of the twofold offence of the glaring heresy of that torn document, and of stating publicly a falsehood equally detestable in itself, and insulting to the members of a great and venerable Council.

Before proceeding, we may be allowed to point out some other inaccuracies which certain of the historians have committed on the subject. Tillemont falls into an error in making the Benedictines, in their life of S. Athanasius, say that the torn document was the creed of Eusebius of Cæsarea. These learned authors having stated, on the authority of Theodoret and Eustathius, that Eusebius of Nicomedia offered a 'rescriptum,' which the Bishops forthwith destroyed, continue thus, 'Verum Ariani, conspecta Catholicorum et frugi homi-'num indignatione, mox Arium Eusebiumque cum sociis 'damnatum iri prospicientes, novam ineunt insidiarum viam, 'rogantesque silentium, ementito pacis concordiæque nomine, 'priores ipsi oblatum libellum, qui omnibus offensioni fuerat, 'damnant et proscribunt, aliumque mox libellum, omnium con-'silio adornatum, muniunt suffragiis suis . . . Hæc ex Theodo-'reto, lib. i. 7. Qui eadem ipsa, c. 8, ex Eustathio confirmat. 'Hallucinantur porro, qui libellum, capite 7 memoratum, diver-'sum esse putant ab alio de quo c. 8, nam idipsum utrobique 'narrari, nemini accuratius legenti, dubium. Hic ipse libellus 'extat in Epistola Eusebii Cæsariensis estque fidei formula."[1]

It is scarcely to be wondered at that Tillemont should have been misled as he was by these historians, for the grammatical meaning of their very confused statement is in fact that which he supposes. But unless they are to fall into a palpable self-contradiction by stating in the beginning of their section, from Theodoret and Eustathius, that the torn document was the rescript of Eusebius of Nicomedia; and at the end, from the same authorities, that it was the 'alius libellus' to which the Arians and the whole Council gave their assent; we must refer their paragraph commencing with the words 'Hæc ex Theodoreto,' not to the sentence immediately preceding, to which it ought grammatically to belong, but to the commencement of the section; and understand the 'hic ipse libellus' following, not of the 'libellum cap. 7 memoratum,' to which it should properly refer, but to the 'alium libellum' mentioned previously: and conclude

[1] Vita Sti. Athanasii, § xiv. p. 8.

their meaning to be that the torn document was in truth the rescript of Eusebius of Nicomedia: and the 'alius libellus' was the 'fidei formula' which they seem to identify with the creed of Eusebius of Cæsarea found in his letter referred to. But in this case, they will be guilty of the fault, inexcusable in them as historians, of stating not merely as their own opinion, but as a positive fact, that Eusebius' creed was supported by the universal consent of the Council, when they have no authority whatever for so sweeping a statement.

Fleury, after mentioning the letter of Eusebius of Nicomedia, which he admits to have been torn, continues,—'The Arians 'likewise presented to the assembly a confession of faith which 'they had drawn up, but as soon as it was read they' (the Council) 'tore it, declaring it to be false and illegal, and a great clamour 'was raised against them, every body accusing them of betray-'ing the truth."[1]

Fleury here commits a twofold mistake. First, he understands Theodoret and Eustathius to speak of two different documents; and secondly, he is in consequence obliged, against all ancient authority, to assert that two documents were torn instead of one. In the latter opinion he is followed by Tillemont, who says, 'Whilst they were debating what determination they 'should come to touching the faith, a letter of Eusebius, says 'S. Athanasius, was produced, which was a plain proof of his 'blasphemies. It was very probably the same letter as that of 'which S. Ambrose speaks. This letter being read in full 'Council confounded him who wrote it, and gave no less concern 'to the saints who heard it, and saw the destruction of those 'wretches, for it discovered all the party. The horror they 'had of it made them tear it publicly.' Soon after, relating the account given by Eusebius of the reception of his creed, he adds, 'Theodoret, without regarding the praise which Eusebius gives himself, assures us that as soon as it was read, it was torn in pieces.' Theodoret, we need not observe, says nothing of the kind. On the contrary, his 13th chapter consists of an attempt to confute the Arians from the writings of Eusebius. Valesius, in his notes on Theodoret, is clear, as are also the Benedictines, that Theodoret and Eustathius refer to one and the same document. The Benedictines in particular speak, as we have seen, very strongly on the subject.

The Creed of Eusebius of Cæsarea, which we have already cited in the Greek, is thus translated by Bishop Kaye:—

'We believe in One God, Father Almighty, Maker of all things, visible and invisible; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Word of God, God of God,

[1] Book xi. § 11.

Light of Light, Life of Life, the only-begotten Son, the first-begotten of every creature, begotten of the Father before all ages, by whom all things were made; who for our salvation was incarnate, and lived (πολιτευσάμενον) among men; who suffered, and rose again the third day, and ascended to the Father, and shall come again in glory to judge both the quick and the dead. We believe also in one Holy Ghost. Each of them we believe to be and to subsist—the Father truly Father, the Son truly Son, the Holy Ghost truly Holy Ghost; as our Lord, when he sent forth his Apostles to preach, said, "Go, make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." '—Pp. 42, 43.

We will here observe by the way, that one of the terms of this creed has not escaped some severe, and evidently unjust censure. Suicer, in his 'Symbolum Nicæno-Constantinopolitanum,' says that the term πολιτευσάμενον, as used by its author of our blessed Lord's stay upon earth, and which the Bishop translates 'lived,' may have been intended to convey a heterodox idea; inasmuch as S. Gregory Nazianzen uses it to express the doctrines of the Apollinarians, who held that Christ was not actually *made* man, as the Nicene Creed teaches in the word ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, but that He only appeared in the guise of man.[1] To say nothing of the palpable injustice of condemning one author for the ordinary use of a term, because of its extraordinary application by another after his time, Suicer, when bringing this charge against Eusebius, must surely have overlooked the fact that he had immediately before used the emphatic word σαρκωθέντα, which is actually the term adopted by the Council. If, however, his creed be free from heretical statements, we can by no means say as much of the letter in which he informed the people of Cæsarea of his motives for having signed the creed of the Council. This letter is suspected even by Bishop Kaye, whose censure is of the more weight from the fact that the singular mildness of his character induces him to be even too sparing of its use.

'The whole letter,' he says, 'is of an apologetic character, and implies a consciousness on the part of the writer, that his subscription to the Nicene Creed required explanation, as if there were expressions in it not in perfect agreement with his former teaching. He states, therefore, that the different expressions were carefully weighed and canvassed; and gives his reasons for assenting to the word ὁμοούσιος, and to the expression "begotten, not made," as well as for concurring in the anathema at the end. He had never, he says, himself used the expressions condemned; nor are they to be found in Scripture. I have noticed the very meagre account given by him of the proceedings of the Synod. The preference shown to the confession of faith finally adopted over his own, and a consciousness, that in subscribing, he had, in some measure, compromised his own opinions, may have contributed to indispose him to dwell on the subject.'—Pp. 40, 41.

[1] Symbolum Nicæno-Constantinopolitanum, p. 213.

The Bishop dismisses, indeed, to a note, a portion of this letter, given by Theodoret, and referred to by S. Athanasius; De Decret. Syn. Nic. § 3, and De Synodis § 13; but omitted by Socrates, and on that account thought to be spurious by Bishop Bull. It is as follows:—'Moreover, we did not think it strange 'to anathematize (the words) "before His Generation He was 'not," since it is admitted by all that He was the Son of God, 'even before His birth according to the flesh. Indeed, our 'most religious emperor then proved by argument that He was, 'even according to His divine Generation, before all ages; for 'even before He was begotten in fact, He was in the Father in 'an unbegotten manner by power, the Father being always the 'Father, as also always King and Saviour; and being all things 'in power, and always existing in the same manner and in the 'same way.' Of course, if these words were really penned by him—and their repeated mention by S. Athanasius is a greater proof of the affirmative than their omission by Socrates is of the negative—his faith, so far, cannot be defended.

He says, moreover, that he agreed to the terms ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας and ὁμοούσιος, because they were not taken by the Council to signify that the Son was any part of the Father, ὡς μέρος ὑπάρχειν τοῦ Πατρὸς, but merely that He was from the Father. Giving Eusebius credit then for demurring to the term ὁμοούσιος, lest it should signify that the Son was 'by division of substance, or by severance, or by any passion, or change, or alteration of the Father's essence or power,'—all of which are foreign to the nature of the Unbegotten Father;—and supposing that if the Council took ὁμοούσιος in the sense he says it did, it was also to avoid the appearance of admitting any division of the one Indivisible Divine Essence: we yet cannot excuse his saying, like the Semi-Arians afterwards, that the term begotten signified merely that the Son of God bore no resemblance to creatures that were made,[1] whilst ποιηθέντα was common to the *other* creatures that were formed by Him:—and still less, if possible, can we admit his treatment of the Arian expressions ἦν πότε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν and ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων, as mere terms which were to be dealt with as such, and rejected simply because they were not found in Scripture; an evasion which, by confining the anathema of the Council to the words alone, would evidently allow the doctrines which they symbolize to be held with, and in despite of it.

We must take leave to differ from Bishop Kaye on a point of

[1] Socrates reads γεννομένων.—Theodoret and the Benedictines in their edition of S. Athanasius, more correctly, γενομένων. The former, however, immediately after, for τὰ γενητὰ κτίσματα of the Benedictines, has γεννητὰ, in which Socrates agrees with him.

some moral weight, and one which affects in no slight degree the chief term of the Creed of the Council. He has followed, without protest, the assertion of Eusebius, which may at least be taken to mean, if it do not necessarily imply, that the introduction of the term ὁμοούσιος originated with the emperor, whilst he adds decidedly that it was he who explained it to the Council;[1] no doubt desiring, as Valesius says, to shelter his own signature of the creed under the imperial authority. Now, we are expressly told that 'Constantine laid down no laws for the Bishops beforehand, but gave each of them free will to decide,"[2] and S. Athanasius says, as we shall shortly see, that the term was adopted by the Bishops after much discussion, as the only way of effectually meeting the sophistries of the Arians; he also gives an account of the preliminary questions, and of the manner in which it was determined to use the word; but without the slightest indication that the emperor had anything to do with its adoption,—if, indeed, he were at that time present in the council.

The next document to be noted as having been presented to the council by the Arians, is the Thalia of their leader, which he had composed when with Eusebius of Nicomedia.[3] It contains such blasphemies as the following:—

> 'The Unoriginate made the Son an origin of things generated,
> And advanced Him as a Son to Himself by adoption;
> He has nothing proper to God in proper subsistence, [or substance—hypostasis—" substantia "—Benedictines]
> For He is not equal—no, nor one in substance with Him.'[4]

It will be matter of surprise to few to hear that the Fathers of the council stopped their ears when it was read.[5]

We now leave the Arians, and glance at the acts of the Catholic Bishops. S. Athanasius is here our chief and almost sole authority. He tells us—to condense his accounts in some degree—'that the Council at first defined the Son to be from 'God, not a creature, or a work, but the proper Son of the 'Father. On this the Eusebians took the expression "from 'God" to apply to Christ, in the same sense as that in which 'it applies to men, "One God, from Whom are all things." '(1 Cor. viii. 6.) The council were then compelled to a more 'clear definition, and said He was from the Essence of God, for 'this appertains to no creature. And when the Bishops said that

---

[1] Having said that the Emperor directed the Council to receive his Creed, he continues: ἐνὸς μόνου προσεγγραφέντος ῥήματος τοῦ ὁμοουσίου ὃ καὶ αὐτὸ ἡρμήνευσε. —Letter to Cæsareans. Soc. i. 8; Theodoret i. 12.

[2] S. Ambrose, Epist. xxi. § 15. [3] S. Athanasius, De Synodis, § 15.

[4] Oxford translation. S. Athanasius's Treatises, vol. viii. p. 95.

[5] S. Athanasius, Ad. Afros, § 13.

'the Word ought to be described as the true Power and Image 'of the Father; and that He was like the Father in all things, 'and unvarying and unchanged, and that He was always, and 'in Him without division . . . . . the Eusebians endured it, not 'daring to contradict them for shame's sake . . . but they were 'detected whispering, and signaling to one another with their 'eyes, that the expressions "like" and "always," and the word '"power" and "in him" are common to us and the Son, and 'we can have no hesitation in agreeing to them. For with re-'gard to "like," it is written of us, "Man is the image and 'glory of God," (1 Cor. xi. 7;) and also "ever," for it is written, '"For we which live are alway," (2 Cor. iv. 11;) and "in Him," '"In Him we live, and move, and have our being," (Acts 'xvii. 28;) and "unchanged," "Nothing shall separate us from 'the love of Christ,"(Rom. viii. 39;) and of "power," that the 'caterpillar and locust are called "power" and "great power," '(Joel ii. 25;)[1] and it is often written of all the people, as "All 'the power of the Lord came out of the land of Egypt," '(Exodus xii. 41.)[1] And others are heavenly powers, for He 'says, "The Lord of powers is with us, the God of Jacob is 'our refuge.' (Psalm xlvi. 7, 8.)[1] But the Bishops, seeing in this 'their hypocrisy . . . . were compelled again to collect together 'the meaning of the Scriptures, and what they said before to 'repeat and write again more clearly, that "the Son was of 'one substance with the Father," that they might signify that 'the Son was not only like the Father, but the same in like-'ness, and show that the Son's likeness and immutability are 'different from the resemblance which is said to be in us, and 'which we attain from virtue on account of our observance of 'the commandments. And after they had thus written, they 'immediately added, "Those who say that the Son of God is 'from nothing, or is created, or changeable, or a work, or of 'another essence . . the Holy Catholic Church anathematises.'[2]

In fact, none of the subsequent branches of the worst Arians could go further than Arius himself had gone before the Council, or show more fearlessness in carrying out the principles of their heresy to their proper and legitimate results, however shocking and detestable,—for he had previously admitted to Alexander, when questioned in the Council at Alexandria, that the Word of God could be perverted as the devil was, because He is created, and therefore susceptible of change. An admission like this, from the mouth of the originator of the heresy, does more to show its true character than volumes penned by an opponent.

---

[1] Septuagint Version. [2] De Decret. Nic. § 19, &c.

The fate that befell the holders of opinions so monstrous and revolting, may be easily imagined. In a Council composed, as we learn from S. Athanasius and the best authorities, of upwards of three hundred Bishops,[1] (to say nothing of the exact specification of 318, with its mystical signification, in the coincidence with the number of Abraham's servants, Gen. xiv. 14, though that idea is as old as the Council itself;) seventeen alone, as Sozomen says,[2] or five according to Socrates,[3] at first refused to sign the creed; and of these but two were found at last to persist in their resolution—Secundus of Ptolemais, and Theonas of Marmarica. Eusebius of Nicomedia, awed by the threats of the emperor, and seeing clearly that there was no alternative but subscription or banishment, subscribed with the rest. Philostorgius,[4] the Arian historian, tells us that he and Maris of Chalcedon had, by the advice of Constantina, the sister of the emperor, furtively substituted ὁμοιούσιος for ὁμοούσιος in the copy of the creed which they signed, and thus pretended to assent to the Council. On this, Secundus said to him, 'You have signed to save yourself, and I trust in God that you will be banished before a year.' He was right, Eusebius's hypocrisy and falsehood did not save him; he was banished within three months from the time of the Council.[5] Eusebius of Cæsarea had refused his signature on the first day, but affixed it on the second. 'He pretended,' to adopt the words of Tillemont, 'that the explication which the Council 'had given of the Consubstantiality, and the love of peace, made 'him sign it, without changing his opinion, the latter part of 'which point seems very true.'[6]

Arius himself met the most severe fate of all. The Synodical letter informs us that his definitions ἦν πότε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν, ἐξ

---

[1] S. Athanasius, Ad. Afros, § 2, says 318; De Decret. Syn. Nic. § 3, more than 300; In Apol. § 23, 300; Soc. i. 8, says 318; so Theodoret, i. 7, 11; Soz. i. 17, says about 320; Eustathius, 270, ap. Theodoret, i. 8. See Tillemont, note 2, on the Council of Nice.

[2] Sozomen, i. 20.

[3] Socrates, i. 8.

[4] Philostorgius, i. 9; Theod. i. 7, 8. We can scarcely agree with Bishop Kaye in his assertion, page 45, note 4, that Philostorgius was an Homœusian; such, at least, is not the general opinion of writers, ancient or modern,—Nicetas, Photius, Gothofred, Cave, and others; all of whom rank him among the Anomœans: and it is certain that he blames Eusebius of Cæsarea for saying that God cannot be known or comprehended (i. 2), which an Homœusian would not have done; the idea that the Son was fully comprehensible having been held only by the very lowest Aëtian or Anomœan division of the heresy. The passage of Eusebius, to which Philostorgius makes allusion, seems to be that contained in the fifth section of the first book of his Theologia Ecclesiastica: 'Let all unspeakable argument about the Son of God be silenced, and to the Father alone be ascribed the knowledge of His generation from Himself; nor let any one proceed further in inquiring about a nature and essence that are ineffable.'

[5] Philostorgius, i. 9, 10; Theodoret, i. 19, 20; Socrates, i. 8; Sozomen, i. 21.

[6] Council of Nicæa, § 10.

οὐκ ὄντων, and others, were condemned.[1] And Sozomen adds, that his Thalia shared the same fate, and that he himself was prohibited from entering Alexandria.[2] Lastly, Constantine, in a letter to the Bishops and people of the Churches, caused Arius himself to be named after the heathen and arch enemy of the Christians, Porphyry; and his followers to be called Porphyrians. He also commanded that his books should be burnt under pain of death.[3] The Council then proceeded to draw up its creed, which is that we still use, except that for the last division, which was afterwards added at the Council of Constantinople, there originally stood the words, 'But those 'who say that there was a time when He was not, and before 'His Generation He was not, and He was formed out of 'nothing, or that He was of another essence or hypostasis, or 'that the Son of God is created, or is changeable, or is muta-'ble, the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church anathematizes.'[4]

The doctrinal questions necessary to be alluded to in a mention of the Creed, are three:—firstly, the history and meaning of the term ὁμοούσιος; secondly, the doctrines intended to be forbidden by the Council in their Anathema of the expression 'Before His Generation He was not;' and, thirdly, 'He is of another essence or *hypostasis*.'

1. We can only consider the history of the term ὁμοούσιος here, its doctrinal meaning we must reserve to a later part of our article; the only objection to this term, derivable from the prior history of the Church, is found in the supposed fact of its having been rejected by the Council held at Antioch in the year 265, against Paul, the heretical Bishop of that See. Granting—what, however, is by no means certain—that the Council did reject this term, it was so treated, as S. Athanasius tells us, from its true meaning having been misunderstood, in that it was supposed to involve the idea that the Divine Essence was material, and therefore in the Generation of the Son underwent division. The words of S. Athanasius are as follows,—'They 'who deposed the Samosatene, took One in substance in a 'bodily sense, because Paul had attempted sophistry, and said, '"Unless Christ has of man become God, it follows that He 'is One in substance with the Father; and if so, of necessity 'there are three substances, one the previous substance, and 'the other two from it;" and therefore, guarding against this, 'they said, with good reason, that Christ was not One in 'substance.'[5]

---

[1] Socrates, i. 9. [2] Socrates, i. 21. [3] Socrates, i. 9.

[4] S. Athanasius, De Decret. Syn. Nic. § 4; Soc. i. 8; Theodoret, i. 12, who omits the word 'created.'

[5] Oxford translation of S. Athanasius's Treatises, vol. viii. p. 143.

Dr. Newman thinks that Paul urged the Council with this dilemma, that the term was either to be taken in a material or in a spiritual sense: the former would make the Son a part of the Father, which was Manicheism; and the latter, as teaching that there was one only Individual, would of course involve the heresy of Sabellius; on which the Fathers of the Council, unable, as we learn from Eusebius, to reply to the sophistries of Paul, forbade the term. Be this as it may, Eusebius of Cæsarea himself acknowledges in his letter, that the word had been formerly used by some learned and illustrious Bishops and writers among the ancients, in their theological teaching about the Father and the Son.

2. The meaning of the Council in their anathema of the words 'Before His Generation He was not,' has been so thoroughly examined by Dr. Newman in his dissertation on the subject, in the first volume of the translation of S. Athanasius's Treatises against the Arians, that in truth nothing more remains to be said. It is well known that the Arians employed the Sonship of Christ to destroy his Godhead, arguing that if He were a Son, He must have had a beginning of existence, before which He was not; *i. e.* He must have been a creature; and their formula, 'before He was begotten He was not,' is, to use Dr. Newman's words, 'an argument *ex absurdo*, drawn from the force of the 'word Son, in behalf of the Arian doctrine; it being, as they 'would say, a truism, that, "whereas He was begotten, He was 'not *before* He was begotten," and the denial of it a contradic-'tion in terms.'[1] To this the Council replied, not by refuting the Arians, nor by explaining the manner of the Catholic doctrine of the Son's co-eternity, for this is ineffable; but by refusing to entertain a conclusion which is inapplicable to its subject. In like manner S. Athanasius and others urge that the argument by analogy, drawn from the generation of creatures, cannot apply to the Creator. S. Gregory Nazianzen, and S. Hilary, as Dr. Newman says, 'both decide that it is not 'true either that the Son, *was* before His Generation, or that 'He was *not*; in other words, that the question is unmeaning 'and irrelevant.'—(P. 276.) And there is this further meaning in the anathema of the Council, although it is not stated in words,—that it is not to be held, as the Arians did hold, that the Son was Generated only at the period immediately preceding that of the Creation. Thus the Council rejects both the Arian fact of the Son, as such, having had a beginning of existence, and the time of that beginning;—but they confine their opposition to the former assertion, because that alone, as being intrinsically the more important, was brought prominently

[1] S. Athanasius's Treatises, Oxford translation, vol. viii. p. 273.

forward by its authors. Grant them the question of fact, and that of time is of little moment, and follows of necessity.

3. The question of the *οὐσία* and *ὑπόστασις* is also one of weight, because, if the Council meant to deny the latter word in the sense which it was ruled to bear in the Council of Alexandria, A. D. 362, as meaning Person, and therefore to teach that the Son has no Personality distinct from the Father, it was plainly guilty of Sabellianism. But this is both incredible and impossible. The word in question has borne two chief senses in theology; one before the Council of Alexandria, and the other after it. In the former it was occasionally used in a sense synonymous with *οὐσία*, and signified essence or substance; in the latter it has a signification equivalent to that of *πρόσωπον*, as used by the earlier theologians, and to this its use was henceforth confined. Now, as it never bore any other than these meanings, and as it is plain from the nature of the case, that the Council of Nice could not have used it in their anathema in the former, we have something more than a mere prior probability that it did use it in the latter.

This, Dr. Newman has in fact converted into something little short of positive certainty. In a dissertation previous to that on the words 'before His Generation He was not,' he has shown that the word *ὑπόστασις* was used by the Westerns to express substance or essence, as *οὐσία* by the Easterns; and that the Council, of which Hosius, a Western, was president, introduced it to convey to that branch of the Church the same idea as was suggested by *οὐσία* to the Easterns.

In taking leave of Nicæa and its creed, we will only observe further, that besides the *ὁμοούσιος*, which includes everything in itself, the Council in this anathema has taught the pure and perfect Godhead of the Son in every manner possible; insisting that He is from Eternity; that He is not from matter which was created, but from the one Essence or Substance of the Father; and, as a result of the Divinity which follows from such essential Oneness, He is not of His own nature subject to the infirmities of mere creatures.

As it is our object to offer an account rather of the doctrinal than of the merely historical phase of Arianism, we must be content with giving a brief outline of the latter, dwelling at length only on one or two of its more difficult and controverted passages.

The events of the twelve years between the Council of Nicæa and the death of Constantine may be thus briefly stated. Soon after the Council, Arius was recalled from banishment, and having, with Euzoïus, palmed off upon Constantine an heretical creed of their own composition as equivalent to that of the Nicene Confession of Faith, was permitted to return to

Alexandria, where, however, S. Athanasius refused to receive him. Eusebius of Nicomedia, and Theognis were also recalled, and restored to their Sees, having declared their willingness to adopt the creed of Nicæa. But the first use of their freedom thus obtained, was to deprive Eustathius, the aged and Catholic Bishop of Antioch, of his See by an infamous calumny, and they then proceeded in their attacks on the orthodox doctrine, and S. Athanasius himself, as its chief defender. In a packed Synod at Tyre, he was accused of the murder of Arsenius a Meletian Bishop; of violence to a female; and of sacrilege. But these charges were disproved by the appearance of Arsenius himself; by his pretended victim not knowing him when she saw him; and by the ascertained fact, that the Church he was said to have profaned did not exist, and that Ischyras, its supposed priest, was an impostor: and their falseness being thus fully exposed, his enemies next sent a commission into Egypt, headed by Theognis, to seek there fresh matters of accusation against him. Though again failing—notwithstanding that in pursuance of their base design they scrupled not at atrocities equalled only in the worst days of Nero or Diocletian—they proceeded, on their return to Tyre, to deprive their enemy of his See, and shortly afterwards to admit Arius into [their] communion. Meanwhile S. Athanasius had left Tyre, and suddenly presenting himself before the emperor at Constantinople, induced the latter, on his solemn appeal, to command the Bishops to discontinue their sittings at Jerusalem, whither they had transferred them by his direction, and to proceed to Constantinople. But six only of the whole number ventured to appear, the Eusebii, Theognis, Patrophilus, Ursacius, and Valens; the rest, terrified at the consequence of their acts, and dreading to meet their victim before the emperor, returned to their Sees.

The Arians then brought an entirely new and most improbable charge against S. Athanasius, accusing him of having threatened to stop the exportation of corn from Alexandria to Constantinople; and the Emperor, either from jealousy of the supposed invasion of his jurisdiction, or, as S. Athanasius himself says, to protect him from the malice of his enemies, banished him to Treves, whilst Arius himself, being now rid of his opponent, came to Constantinople.

And now it was that the heresiarch is recorded to have committed that atrocious perjury which was so speedily and so signally avenged in his death. On coming before the Emperor, he offered a second Confession of Faith, declaring with an oath that he believed what he then professed; but Socrates tells us that he held concealed in his sleeve another paper, containing his real belief. The Emperor, as if suspecting perfidy, ex-

claimed, 'If thy faith be right, thou hast sworn well; but if otherwise, God will avenge thy perjury.' But being unable to prove the fraud, Constantine gave orders that Alexander (who was still Bishop of Constantinople) should admit Arius into communion on the following day, which was Sunday. The other events of that Saturday—the Bishop Alexander's solemn prayer in Church; ἆρον Ἄρειον, that God would either remove him from the world, or take the instrument of those evils with which the Church was threatened; Arius's momentary triumph, and sudden and immediate death—have been told too often to need a lengthened repetition in these pages. We shall confine our remarks to the frequently mooted question, of the immediate cause of the death of the heresiarch. Gibbon says, that if we press the literal narrative of his death, we must make our option between a miracle or poison,[1] an assertion in which he has not been without followers. Bishop Kaye, however, confesses himself unable to see this necessity. 'There is 'nothing in the circumstances,' he says, 'which, if we make 'due allowance for exaggeration, may not be accounted for by 'natural causes. It was not a miraculous or preternatural in-'terposition; but a most striking and awful event, occurring in 'the ordinary course of God's providential government.'—P. 79.

S. Athanasius relates the event as follows:—ὁ ... Ἄρειος ἐθάρρει τοὺς περὶ Εὐσέβιον, πολλά τε φλναρῶν, εἰσῆλθεν εἰς καθέδρας ὡς διὰ χρείαν τῆς γαστρὸς, καὶ ἐξαίφνης κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον πρηνὴς γενόμενος ἐλάκησε μέσος, καὶ πεσὼν ἐνθὺς ἀπέψυξεν, ἀμφοτέρων τε τῆς κοινωνίας καὶ τοῦ ζῆν ἀπεστερήθη. Τὸ μὲν οὖν τέλος τοῦ Ἀρείου τοιοῦτον γέγονε. From the fact of his having avowedly cited the words in which S. Peter described the death of Judas Iscariot, it would appear as if he were speaking as a rhetorician rather than as a historian; and besides, he derived his information, not from his own immediate knowledge, for he was not at Constantinople at the time, but from the report of his presbyter Macarius. The account, however, as he relates it, is physically impossible. Macarius was probably deceived by a rumour, to which neither he nor S. Athanasius were anatomists or pathologists enough to affix the true value.

But it is not so with the relation of the same event given by Socrates, who, we should remember, lived within a century of its occurrence, and penned his history in the city in which it happened. He tells us that 'a terror of conscience seized Arius, 'followed by a sudden looseness. On retiring, he was seized 'with faintness; the bowel with its contents came away; a 'vast quantity of blood, with the smaller intestines, the liver,

[1] Chap. xxi note o, in loc.

'and spleen followed, and Arius instantly died.' Allowing something, perhaps, for exaggeration, and a good deal for mistakes in the attendants, this account is by no means at variance with nature. Put into correct language, it would stand as follows:—Arius, either from the effects of strong mental emotion, or from physical causes, or from a combination of both, is seized with internal hæmorrhage, an effusion of blood, that is to say, into the alimentary canal, which compels him to retire; he suffers from violent relaxation, and from faintness, with profuse discharge of blood, accompanied, probably, with prolapsus of the lower bowel; and the death, which is the immediate result, is as natural as any of which we read in the daily bills of mortality. But the fiction, or rather the erroneous part of the narrative, now commences. This hæmorrhage, Socrates says, was followed by the discharge of the small intestines, the liver, and the spleen. Such an occurrence is impossible; but it is by no means impossible that the attendants may have believed, by a succession of very pardonable mistakes, such as, in fact, are still of daily occurrence, that they saw what is here stated; stringy mucus being mistaken by them for the small intestines, and masses of firm coagula, for liver and spleen. In short, the train of symptoms which are mentioned, and the sudden death in which they terminated, are by no means of uncommon occurrence; and if the report of Socrates be divested of its errors, (which very errors may be said to add to its intrinsic truthfulness,) this is just the case we have before us.

What, then, are we to conclude of this most remarkable catastrophe? As, on the one hand, we hold the death of Arius to have been a natural one, requiring the intervention neither of miracle nor of poison to account for it—the former, as caused by an infraction of the laws of nature, or the latter, as involving the wickedness of man;—so, on the other hand, when we call to mind the unmatched and complicated impieties of that heresiarch; the revolting profanity of his life and writings; his flagitious contempt of the Divine Name, in prostituting it, as he did, to the vilest purposes; his open insults on God's Church and ministers; all crowned and consummated by that last great act of perjury; and all uniting to make his a singular case in the history of the Church, and to point it out as the one in which, perhaps above all others on record, we might expect the manifestation of some peculiar mark of Divine Vengeance: we may well be excused if, with becoming reverence and due fear, we do regard it, as it was regarded in the age in which it happened, and long after,[1] as a signal and most awful judgment

[1] Socrates says, that a century after its occurrence 'passers-by still pointed the finger at the scene of it as a place accursed.'

from Heaven; an especial act of the wrath of God; vindicating His own outraged majesty, and at once, (by natural means, a guilty conscience acting on the body, directed especially by Him to this end,) cutting off the offender in the very hour of, as he imagined, his perfect triumph and most assured success.

Constantine died not long after Arius. One of the first acts of the Eusebians, on his demise, was to renew their accusations against S. Athanasius, who was now again in possession of his See, to the sons of Constantine, and Julius, Bishop of Rome. S. Athanasius thereupon held a council at Alexandria consisting of nearly one hundred bishops, the letter of which was sent to Julius as his defence. Julius proposed to the legates of the contending parties to hold a council at Rome, at which they might both meet; an invitation which S. Athanasius readily accepted. The events that followed, and their exact chronology, are involved in much obscurity, and form, in fact, the difficulty of the Athanasian history. The statement and dates of the greater number of historians,—Valesius, the Benedictines in their life of S. Athanasius, Cave, Fleury, and others, are as follows:—

In the year 340, S. Athanasius held the Council at Alexandria. He arrived at Rome soon after Easter of 341, and stayed there three years, being summoned in the fourth year by Constans to meet him at Milan. On the arrival of S. Athanasius, Julius sent two of his presbyters, by name Elpidius and Philoxenus, as legates to the Eusebians at Antioch, inviting them to meet S. Athanasius in council at Rome in the January of the following year, 342. Elpidius and Philoxenus left Rome in the beginning, says Valesius, or about the latter end of May, or according to the Benedictines early in June, of 341; the Eusebians detained the messengers of Julius till the time for holding the Council at Rome was passed, and then sent them away, refusing to come themselves. Elpidius and Philoxenus arrive in Rome with a letter for Julius, (given in substance by Sozomen, book iii. chap. 8,) in the course of the summer of 342. In the October or November of that year a council of fifty bishops was held in the church of Vito a presbyter, in which S. Athanasius was acquitted of all charge, and formally received the Communion of the Western Church. Julius now produced the letter of the Eusebians, (which, he says in his reply to them, he had kept by him for some time, hoping that they, or some of them, might yet come to Rome,) and he was requested by the Council to answer it: this he did, and his letter is found in S. Athanasius's Apology against

the Arians.[1] He mentions in it that S. Athanasius had now been eighteen months at Rome, which of course would be the case according to the dates here proposed.

This arrangement, however, simple as it is in itself, and consistent with the statements of Julius in his letter, and of S. Athanasius in his works, seems, at first sight, open to more than one objection. S. Athanasius says that he left Alexandria on the report of the intended invasion of his see by Gregory the Arian, (whom the members of the Church of Antioch ordained and sent to Alexandria in his place,) without waiting for his actual arrival; and it may be thought that as Gregory entered Alexandria at the latter end of the Lent of the year in which S. Athanasius came to Rome, there would not have been time, if that year were 341, for the Council to have ordained him at Antioch, and for him to have reached Alexandria so soon afterwards. But the Council was held at Antioch early in the year, and S. Athanasius says that Gregory did not arrive till quite towards Easter (which fell that year on April 19th)—Ταῦτα δε ἐγιγνέτο ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἁγίᾳ Τεσσαρακοστῇ περὶ το πάσχα.[2] If, again, we put his arrival a year later, *i. e.* in 342, we have a still greater difficulty, we think, to contend with—for there is nothing in this case by which to account for the time that must have elapsed between his ordination and that event. It is plain, too, that the Arians, in so gross a case of usurpation, would be anxious to get their follower established in his sphere of action as soon as possible after they had appointed him to it; and lastly, if Julius answered the Council in 342, the same year in which S. Athanasius in this case came to Rome, there could not have been eighteen months for him to have spent in the city when that letter was written. And we may here glance at a point of little moment in itself, and which, except that Bishop Kaye has touched upon it, we should have passed without notice. The Bishop observes (page 92 and note 1), that Athanasius says himself, in his piece Ad Solitarios, that he left Rome at the first rumour of the entrance of Gregory, and before it actually took place. He is said by Sozomen (iii. 6), to have been in his church at Alexandria when the soldiers came, and to have escaped during the singing of a psalm. Some such arrangement as that suggested by the Benedictines in their life of S. Athanasius is no doubt the solution of the difficulty. They think that when Gregory first entered, and, among other outrages, burnt a church dedicated to Cyrinus, S. Athanasius was at Alexandria, and that being informed of this violence, he fled, remained some days concealed in the neighbourhood, and then sailed for Rome.

[1] Vol. i. Benedict. Edit.

[2] Encyl. ad Episc. tom. i. § 4, Benedict.

A more serious difficulty, perhaps, is how Julius, if he appointed the Council at Rome for January, could have written to the Eusebians, as he did at the *end* of the year, and evidently from a Council. Baronius, with a view to this difficulty, has supposed that two councils were held at Rome, the one of fifty bishops, at which S. Athanasius was received, and which he puts in the year 341, and another in the following year, in which Julius answered the Easterns. But Valesius has proved, from the words of S. Athanasius and Julius, whose accounts of the matter exactly agree, that there was only one, which we may easily suppose was adjourned from time to time, or it may have continued its sittings through the summer, as that of Antioch had done the previous year, if it despatched Gregory to Alexandria in Lent, and received the legates of Julius in the autumn, keeping them over the January following, and not till then sending them back to Julius; or, lastly, Julius may have written from the usual autumnal synod.

The final question connected with these events is, whether S. Athanasius visited Rome once only, or twice. Valesius, the Benedictines, Cave, Fleury, and others, are clear that he came to that city only once—leaving before the arrival of Gregory, and not returning again until after the Council of Sardica in 347. Baronius, Tillemont, Cabassutius, and others, oppose them, and adopt the other opinion. Baronius thinks that Athanasius arrived in Rome the first time in 340, and remained there eighteen months, *i. e.* towards the close of 341, or the beginning of 342—when he supposes him to have returned to Alexandria fortified with the acquittal of Julius and the Roman Council. He then places the invasion of Gregory in the Lent of 342, during or before which he makes S. Athanasius return to Rome the second time, just after the arrival of Elpidius and Philoxenus, and the second Council, which Julius then held, and in which he replied to the Easterns. But this arrangement, among other disadvantages, involves an inordinately long absence of the legates of Julius, whom Baronius despatches to Antioch in 340 and does not bring back to Rome till 342—an absence which, in addition to the above objection, is against the spirit of Julius's letter to the Easterns, as Valesius urges. Tillemont, by an arbitrary alteration of Julius's letter, follows an arrangement of his own. He also makes two journeys of S. Athanasius to Rome, but he dates the first in 339, and puts Athanasius's return to Alexandria in 340, in consequence of the rumours of what was doing at Antioch, which seems directly against S. Athanasius's own account of his movements, that he thereupon left Alexandria for Rome, instead of leaving Rome for Alexandria. The second journey he puts in the Lent of 341, and,

having sent the legates of Julius to the East in the year 340, he puts the Council at Rome in *June* of the former year, (to which he alters Julius's January,) and considers it to have sat till the autumn, Julius having written his answer to the Easterns not earlier than August or September. But as this arrangement would not allow S. Athanasius to have passed eighteen continuous months at Rome when the Council is held and the letter of Julius written, he is obliged to make them consist of broken periods, part in the first visit and part in the second, for which he has no authority of any kind.

These historians found their opinion on the words of Socrates, who says, (book ii. chap. 11,) that after Gregory had arrived at Alexandria, Athanasius immediately left that city and hastened to Rome, Gregory being installed into his place; and (chap. 15,) that he, with several other bishops, submitted his case to Julius, who restored each bishop to his See, on which they (with Athanasius, as it appears, among them,) returned to their dioceses. On this, he continues, a sedition was raised at Alexandria by the partisans of *George* the Arian bishop, and (chap. 17,) that Athanasius was accused to Constantius of having sold the corn which Constantine had granted to the poor of Alexandria, on which Constantius threatened to put him to death, and he concealed himself. Julius, hearing of this, invited him to come to Rome, after which, says this historian, Julius received, and replied to, the letters of the Easterns.

It is plain that little reliance can be placed on this account. George was not made Bishop of Alexandria by the Arians till the year 356, and it is therefore impossible that his followers could have molested S. Athanasius at this time. Valesius supposes that Socrates has repeated himself, in the chapter last mentioned, and that we are to understand him as there alluding to the same visit of S. Athanasius to Rome as that in chap. 11. If so, putting Julius's receipt of the letters of the Eusebians, and his reply to them, after this so-called second, but in truth first and only visit of S. Athanasius to Rome, there will be no substantial variation between the accounts of Socrates and of S. Athanasius, Julius, and the majority of modern historians, although of course the ground on which Baronius and Tillemont build their idea of the double visit of S. Athanasius to Rome will be cut from under them. Valesius, moreover, questions the possibility of S. Athanasius having returned to Alexandria without the letters of the Emperor. These he proves him to have had on his restoration to his See from his first exile at Treves, and after the Council of Sardica, but he says there is no trace of them at this time.

If so, as regards the dates of these events, we can only con-

clude with the Benedictines that S. Athanasius was not at Rome when the Eusebians sent their legates thither, A.D. 339, nor when the Council was held at Alexandria, and legates were despatched from it to Rome in 340, nor in the Lent of 341, when Gregory invaded Alexandria;—but that he arrived there in May 341, and in November of 342 Julius wrote to the Eusebians that he had been there eighteen months.[1] For the rest of the history we refer our readers to Bishop Kaye.

The death of Constantine introduces us to a different scene. Hitherto the efforts of the Arians had been directed against the Catholic bishops alone. Knowing the real mind of Constantine on the Council of Nicæa, they had not ventured formally to set up any other Creed than the one then published; but from the accession to the death of Constantius, scarcely a year passed in which some division of the Arians, now through court influence become the dominant party, did not meet to produce a fresh Creed. Bishop Kaye has given a partial enumeration of those which are yet extant; and as they form one of the most prominent features of the heresy, and as a comparison of them is of much use in its elucidation, we will complete his list, and lay before our readers such portions of each as bear reference to the doctrines of Arianism; omitting those which are not immediately to the point, or which treat of questions that were uncontroverted. They show, unanswerably, and out of the mouths of their own framers and upholders, that it is impossible to conceive any idea of a Redeemer between that of the true Nicene doctrine and of a mere Humanitarianism, to which latter idea all these documents of whatever class, carefully as they may strive to disguise or escape the fact, do most assuredly tend.

1. The first doctrinal statement of the party, though not formally a creed, is that contained in a letter written by Arius to Alexander, and contained in the Encyclical Epistle of that bishop, portions of which are as follows:—'Christ was not 'always the Word of God, but was made from nothing; He is 'a creature and a work; He does not resemble the Father in 'essence, nor is He His true and natural Word or Wisdom, 'but, being one of His works and creatures, is called so impro-'perly; He is foreign to, and diverse from the Essence of God, 'and He does not perfectly and accurately know the Father, 'nor is He able truly to see Him. He was created for our 'sakes, and would not have existed had not God pleased to 'create us.'[2]

2. The Creed that Arius with Euzoïus gave to Constantine

[1] §§ 8. 11. Vita S. Athanasii, p. xlii. [2] Soc. i. 6.

in the year 331 ran as follows:—"We believe in . . . Jesus 'Christ the Son of God, who was *created* before all ages, God 'the Word, by whom all things were made in heaven and 'earth,' &c. Rufinus describes this Creed as 'Symbolum sensu 'quidem alienum a Nicæna fide, verbis tamen haudquaquam 'dissentientem.'[1] The one which he concealed in his sleeve, if, as Valesius thinks, it were different to this, has perished.

3. At the Council of Antioch, in 341, the party published four creeds, which are the first types of those Semi-Arian formulæ which were afterwards so rife. In the first, after disclaiming Arius as their master, they say merely: 'We believe 'in one Only-begotten Son of God, Who was before all ages, 'and was with the Father Who begot Him,' &c.

4. The second, which, according to Sozomen, the Arians professed to have found in the handwriting of Lucian, is of a higher cast of doctrine. It says, as S. Athanasius has given it, 'We 'believe in one Lord Jesus Christ the Son, the only-begotten 'God, by Whom were all things, Who was begotten before all 'ages of the Father, God of God, Whole of Whole, Only of 'Only, Perfect of Perfect, King of King, Lord of Lord, Living 'Word, Living Wisdom, True Light, Way, Truth, Resurrec-'tion, Shepherd, Door, Unchangeable and Immutable, the unal-'tered Image of the Father, the First-born of every creature, 'Who was in the beginning with God, God the Word, as it is 'written in the Gospel, "And the Word was God." . . . He 'was the Mediator between God and man.' In the conclusion it anathematizes those who say, 'that time or season or age 'either is or has been before the generation of the Son, or that 'the Son is a creature (κτίσμα) as one of the creatures, or an 'offspring as one of the offsprings, or a work (ποίημα) as one 'of the works.'

Whether this creed were really Lucian's, or not, of course we cannot say; but if it were, his followers kept on the whole to their master's doctrine, for however their expressions may vary, this may be taken as a fair sample of true Semi-Arian belief, which acknowledged, with the former part of the above creed, a Godhead of Christ, though one inferior to that of the Father; but held at the same time with the latter part, that He was in fact a creature; by which contradiction they must, if pressed, have either fallen into Arianism on the one hand, or into a Ditheistic creed on the other.

With this dilemma, S. Athanasius does not fail to press them: I. he says, to call Christ a creature, though with the qualification, 'not as one of the creatures,' is still to make Him essentially a creature; as to term Him 'an offspring, but not as

[1] Valesius' Annotations on Sozomen, ii. 30.

one of the offsprings,' is to deny that He is the only-begotten. 'One creature,' he argues, 'differs from another, light from 'light, sun from moon, angels from thrones; yet they are 'all creatures, and all remain in their own essence as they 'were made.' [1]

II. To adopt Bishop Kaye's condensed account of S. Athanasius's words,

> 'The Arians are justly open to the charge of Polytheism or Atheism, because they speak of the Son as a creature external to the Father, and say that the Spirit is from that which was not. Either they say that the Word is not God, or, being compelled by the letter of Scripture to admit that He is God, yet, by asserting that He is not proper to the essence of the Father, they give opportunity for the introduction of many Gods, because of their difference in kind. . . Athanasius enlarges upon the absurdities which flow from the Arian doctrine. By making the Son a creature, and yet acknowledging Him to be God, they introduce two Gods, one the Creator, the other a creature; one increate, the other created; and they have a twofold faith, one in the true God, the other in Him whom they have made and framed, and called God. . . They charge the Catholics with saying that there are two increate; but while they deny that there are two increate, they introduce two Gods, and these having different natures, one created, the other increate.' [2]

The Oxford annotator thinks the word 'Mediator' the most catholic of this creed; but it must have escaped him that Eusebius of Cæsarea employs the same expression to avoid the confession both of the true Godhead and Manhood: '"A 'Mediator is not of one, for He has not His essence to be 'defined a Mediator in the case of one; wherefore He is not a 'mean of one, but necessarily a mean of two, being neither of 'those between whom He is . . . . when He is Mediator between 'God and man, being between each class He is neither because 'He is a Mediator, being neither He Who is the One and only 'God, nor a man like other men."' [3]

5. The creed of Lucian not satisfying the Arians, they at the same Council adopted another, framed by Theophronius, Bishop of Tyana, a city afterwards the scene of a Catholic Council. This creed teaches that Christ is 'the Only-begotten 'Son, God, Word, Power, and Wisdom, begotten of the Father 'before the ages, perfect God of perfect God, with God in 'hypostasis.'

6. They drew up, lastly, a fourth formula a few months later, which they sent to Constans in France. It terms Christ 'the 'Only-begotten Son our Lord . . . before all ages begotten from 'the Father, God of God, Light of light, by Whom all things 'were made . . . Word, Wisdom, Power, Life, true Light.' At the

[1] Oration ii. § 19. Kaye, p. 191.
[2] S. Athanasius, Oration iii. § 16. Bp. Kaye, pp. 231, 232.
[3] Contra Marcellum, lib. i. chap. 1.

conclusion it anathematizes those who say that 'the Son is from nothing, or is of another Substance, ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστασέως, and not from God, or that there was a time when He was not.' Taking hypostasis, with the Benedictines and Bishop Kaye, to be synonymous with *οὐσία*, in which sense alone it would have been used by the Arians, as the chief opponents of Sabellianism, it is difficult to see how the second of these anathemas, if stated positively, can, in itself, be taken to express any but the Nicene doctrine.

We will here pause to correct a singular mistake of Baronius': Julius, in his letter to the Easterns, objected against the bishops of the Council of Antioch, who sent Gregory to usurp the see of S. Athanasius, as being incapable of ordaining a Bishop to Alexandria, because they were distant from that city thirty-six stages—ἐκ τριάκοντα καὶ ἐξ μονῶν—when the canon law required that every bishop should be ordained by the bishops of his own province. Baronius takes these words to refer to the Arians who were present at the Council, and he accordingly says, on their authority, that 'from so great a 'number of bishops as were there,' (ninety as S. Athanasius says, ninety-seven according to S. Hilary, ninety-nine as we read in Sozomen,) 'there were *only thirty-six Arians* who agreed to 'the decrees of the Council, which they carried their own way, 'either by clandestine means, or through the support of the 'emperor!'[1]

7. Three years after this Council they met again, and produced the Creed which is called from its length the Macrostich; in which they speak of Christ in the same language as that of the fourth Antiochene. They also published, with others, the same anathemas, adding however a partial belief of the doctrine of the Circumincessio, or περιχώρησις, 'all the Father em-'bosoming the Son, and all the Son hanging and adhering to 'the Father, and resting in His bosom continually'—and in 'an 'all-perfect Trinity, that is, the Father and the Son and the 'Holy Ghost'—'and we call,' they say, 'the Father God and 'the Son God; but they are not two Gods, for we confess one 'dignity of the Godhead, and one exact harmony of the kingdom. 'For thus have the Divine words handed down to us the 'account that the Divine Monarchy exists in Christ.' At the same time that they speak in this catholic manner, on the one hand, they also, on the other, on the strength of Proverbs viii. 22, and in terms closely resembling those of the Creed of Lucian, make Him a creature. This Creed they sent into Italy.

[1] A.D. 341. §§ 4, 5.

8. The Council of Sardica, A.D. 347,[1] being composed of Catholic Bishops, admitted no new Creed; but the Arian Council of Philippopolis, held in opposition to it, repeated the fourth Creed of Antioch. In its anathema, however, the word 'substantia' is used for the 'hypostasis' of that Council. Their anathemas are mostly composed of those of the fourth Antiochene and Macrostich. According to Socrates and Sozomen, there now first fell on the Church the shadow of an event which was to come long afterwards; the separation of East and West: each, after this Council, following the division of the empire, and keeping to its own side of the range of Mounts Hæmus and Rhodope, which formed the boundary of Thrace and Illyricum.[2]

9. The first Sirmian, A.D. 351, was their next Creed. It is, as far as our subject is concerned, a repetition of the fourth Antiochene.

10. Sulpicius Severus makes mention of an epistle published by the Arians, in the name of Constantius, at the Council of Milan, A.D. 355, which is not extant. It would appear to have been of a more decidedly Arian cast than any of the preceding, for that historian describes it as 'omni pravitate refertam,' and the people refused to receive it.[3]

11. The second Sirmian, A.D. 357, shows a considerable decline in doctrine, forbidding all use of the words ὁμοούσιος or ὁμοιούσιος, as perplexing people's minds, and not being found in Scripture. It applies John xx. 17, and x. 29, to establish the Semi-Arian doctrine of an inequality in the Godhead of the Father and Son, but allows (against Anomæanism) that the Son only, with the Father, knows the manner of His own Generation. It was this Creed which the aged Hosius was persecuted into signing.

12. In the following year the Semi-Arians held a Council at Ancyra, under Basil the Bishop—the leader of the Semi-Arians—in protest against the last, as Dr. Newman thinks. To its creed were attached eighteen anathemas, twelve of which are preserved by S. Hilary; the eighteenth seems to have repeated the opposition of the Council last-mentioned to the term 'of One Substance;' but it appears to have been soon suppressed.[4]

13. In the same year the same party published another Creed, composed of the so-called Creed of the Council of

---

[1] We have given the usual date of this Council, but it is a question of some uncertainty. Our limits do not allow us to discuss it; but those who wish to examine the question at length will find a full dissertation on it in the preface of the Historical Tracts of S. Athanasius, Lib. Fathers, vol. xiii.

[2] Soc. ii. 22. Soz. iii. 13. Socrates terms this range τίσουκις. See Valesius in loc.

[3] History, book ii. chap. 55. [4] Tillemont, Hist. Arians, § 73.

Antioch, against Paul of Samosata, the Dedication or second Antiochene, and the first Sirmian. It is not extant; but according to Sozomen, the prohibition of 'One Substance' was again repeated. It was probably this Creed which S. Hilary so bitterly upbraids Liberius, Bishop of Rome, for having signed.

14. In 359 they published the third Sirmian, which says, 'We believe ... in the One Only-begotten Son of God, Who 'was before all conceivable time, and all comprehensible sub-'stance—begotten impassibly from God ... and was the Only 'from the Only Father,—God of God,—like the Father Who 'begot Him in all things, Whose Generation none knows but 'the Father only.' It concludes with forbidding the use of the word substance, *οὐσία*, for the same reasons as those alleged by the second Sirmian for forbidding *ὁμοούσιος* and *ὁμοιούσιος*, and adds, 'We affirm that the Son is like the Father in all things, as the Holy Scriptures also say and teach.'

To this Creed the framers were so unhappy as to attach the names of the Consuls, 'to show to all thinking persons,' says S. Athanasius, 'that their faith has its commencement not from antiquity, but now from the time of Constantius.'

15. The next Creed is that of Seleucia, A.D. 359, the preamble of which anathematizes *ὁμοούσιος*, *ὁμοιούσιος* and *ἀνόμοιος*, and confesses merely *ὅμοιος*, from S. Paul, Coloss. i. 15: 'Who is the Image of the Invisible God, the First-born of every creature.' The Creed itself speaks of Christ as 'Begotten before all time, God the Word, God of God, Light, Life,' &c. like the fourth Antiochene.

This, however, not pleasing them, they went from Seleucia to Nice in Thrace, and there drew up another Creed, which the deputies from the Council of Ariminum, who were present, signed, and took back to that Council, which also adopted it. It terms Christ 'The Only-begotten Son of God, begotten of 'God before all ages, and before every *ἄρχη*, by Whom all things 'were made, ... begotten as Only-begotten, Only of the Only 'Father, God of God, like the Father Who begot Him—ac-'cording to the Scriptures;' at the conclusion it forbids the use both of *οὐσία* and *ὑπόστασις*. It was this Council, of which S. Jerome says, in his treatise against the followers of Lucifer, 'Ingemuit totus orbis et Arianum se esse miratus est.' But this transformation was only in appearance, not in truth. There is in S. Hilary, Hist. Frag. xi., a letter from the Gallican Bishops, who had been deceived into signing the Creed, to the Easterns, in which they say, 'We have embraced 'the word *ὁμοούσιος*, to express the true and proper birth of 'the Only-begotten God, of God the Father... born of a whole 'and perfect God, Who is incapable of birth, and He is there-

'fore confessed by us to be of one Essence or Substance with 'God the Father, lest He should rather appear as a creature 'or adoption or appellation.' 'And because He is from Him as 'a Son from the Father, or God from God . . . we not un- 'willingly admit His likeness to God the Father (for He is the 'Image of the Invisible God); but we understand that only 'similitude, worthy to be compared to the Father, which is [the 'similitude] of very God to very God, so that there is to be 'understood not numerical oneness of Divinity (unio); but the 'quality of oneness (unitas), because unio is singular (*i. e.* the 'number one); but unity is the fulness of Him who is born 'according to the truth of the Nativity, especially since our 'Lord Jesus Christ declared to His disciples, "I and my Father 'are One," by which He signifies *not only* the love which He 'had to the Father, but also the Godhead, which is God of 'God, according to the words, "He that hath seen Me hath 'seen the Father."'[1]

It is certain, that if these Bishops had been really Arians, they would not only have refused the ὁμοούσιος in any sense, but would also have omitted that confession, by implication, of the Circumincessio, with which our extract concludes, allowing instead of an essential unity of Father and Son, only a moral union,—which, as it is, they expressly and in terms repudiate. The Creed of Ariminum was confirmed by the Acacians, in a Council held at Constantinople in the following year, *i. e.* A.D. 360.

16. Lastly, to crown the whole, a Council of Arians was held at Antioch in the year 361, which came back to the original type of the heresy, and to the very point from which Arius had started in the beginning; teaching that the Son was, in all things, both in substance and in will, unlike the Father; and that He was created ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων.[2] But they had previously admitted the Son to be God; and when asked, says Socrates, how they reconciled these last assertions with that confession, they replied that He was God of God in the sense in which the Apostle says, (1 Cor. xi. 12,) 'All things are of God—one of which things the Son is.' Unable to endure the reproaches which this assertion brought on them, they returned to the Creed of Constantinople.

Thus there are three types of Semi-Arian doctrine in these formularies. This phase of Arianism, as opposed to the faith of Nice, taught, in a word, the Son's similarity to, instead of His perfect identity with, the Father in nature, and it is expressed, as has been said in the above Creeds, in a threefold manner: first, in the higher sense of the fourth Antiochene and Philippopolitan Creeds, that the Son is from no other hypostasis, or substantia,

[1] Hist. Frag. vi. [2] Sozomen, iv. 29.

than the Father; a term which, although it may appear to express more, was probably meant by those who used it to be of equal force with their ὁμοιούσιος: and this the Church has always rejected as being clearly inadequate to express the pure Godhead of its Subject, inasmuch as it may also be used of angels and the souls of men. Secondly, He is said to be 'like the Father according to the Scriptures;' a form of speech which either results in the same idea as that of ὁμοιούσιος, in which case it becomes a mere repetition and superfluity; or tends to the lower one expressed by, thirdly, the vague generalism that He is merely 'like;' a term which is, to say the least, radically deficient, as it may also be used, in a sense, of everything that has life. Besides these, there is the pure Arianism, that He is 'unlike.' A little reflection will show that this last expression, far from being a perversion of the others, is in truth its explanation, its natural and necessary result. If the Son, as the Semi-Arians taught, is only like the Father quoad *entem*,—which is the real and final meaning of their definitions,—He must, like all creatures, be unlike Him quoad *Deum*, and it is thus that Semi-Arianism is at last found to merge into true Arianism. Then such of the professors of the former as are shocked at this conclusion are compelled to fall back upon the only possible alternative, the true and Catholic doctrine of the One Substance.

Soon after the last-mentioned Council of Antioch, Constantius died; and as with him the era of Arian and Semi-Arian creeds had derived its commencement, so also with him it came to an end.

This event was followed by the accession of Julian. One of the earliest acts of the new emperor was to recal the banished bishops, and grant a universal toleration. This measure gave peace for a time to the Church; and its immediate result, as regards S. Athanasius, was the calling a Council at Alexandria, A.D. 362, to remedy in some measure the disorders of the times. The first thing ordered was the reception of all who were willing to return to the Church, on condition of their condemning the heresies of Arius, and of those Macedonians who asserted the Holy Ghost to be a Creature different in Essence from the Son, and confessing the Creed of Nicæa.

Writing subsequently to Rufinianus, in answer to his question as to what had been done in the Council about these unhappy persons, S. Athanasius says that it seemed good to grant pardon to the leaders if they repented, but not to allow them the rank of clergy; but that those who had not lapsed willingly, but had been forced into heresy, should be pardoned, and allowed to retain their orders, 'especially,' he continues,—and this is the only

passage in the life or writings of this great upholder of God's truth that must excite our disapprobation,—we might in an ordinary case be justified in using a stronger term,—'especially as 'they offered a credible excuse, and proved that this was done 'in a manner œconomically, for they declared that "they had not 'been drawn into impiety; but, lest certain of the most aban-'doned should be appointed in their places, and corrupt the 'Churches, they preferred rather to yield to compulsion, and 'bear the burthen, than destroy the people:" and, in saying 'this, they appeared to us to speak credibly, for they instance, in 'their exculpation, the case of Aaron, the brother of Moses, 'who, in the desert, united with the transgression of the people, 'and urged as his excuse, that they would otherwise have re-'turned to Egypt, and remained in their idolatry.'[1] We submit that not the widest latitude that can possibly be accorded to the term œconomy, could justify even S. Athanasius in so treating a case which Holy Scripture itself has expressly condemned.

The Council then proceeded to inquire into the meanings affixed to the word Hypostasis by parties in the Church who differed on the subject; and finding that they who confessed one Hypostasis did not use the word in a Sabellian sense, but conceived it to be equivalent to Essence, and that they who spoke of three Hypostases did not hold three Principles, or three Gods, but took the word in the sense of Person, and that both alike received the Nicene Creed, it was decided that either sense was allowable. From this time, however, *οὐσία* has been confined to express the Essence, and Hypostasis to distinguish the Persons of the Holy Trinity.

Lastly, against the heresy lately adopted by Apollinaris, denying the reasonable part of the soul of Christ, and supplying its place by the Godhead, the Council declared the true faith of His nature, that He had a reasonable soul and mind, together with human flesh.

The letter of the Council was carried to Antioch, in hopes of composing certain divisions then rife in that city, for an account of which we must be content with referring to Bishop Kaye. Julian was killed in the Persian war, A. D. 362, and was succeeded by Jovian, to whom, at his own request, S. Athanasius, with a synod of bishops to support his authority, sent a letter containing a statement of the Christian faith as defined at Nicæa, in which he dwells chiefly on the novelty of the Arian and Macedonian heresies, and the want of authority of their authors. Jovian consequently refused all countenance to the heretical bodies. The Acacians, however, with Acacius himself at their head, as if to make their time-serving and irreligious

[1] Tom. i. part ii. pp. 768, 769.

spirit the more glaring, now held a Council at Antioch, in which they addressed the emperor, professing their acceptance of the Nicene Creed; a movement peculiarly odious in those who had long been among the foremost of the Semi-Arians, and had ruled at Constantinople no longer ago than the year 360, as we have seen, that the terms, 'consubstantial' and 'like in substance' were to be wholly forbidden.

Jovian, after a brief reign of eight months, died suddenly, and was succeeded in the East by the Arian Valens. S. Athanasius was hereupon once more driven from Alexandria; but the policy, rather than the humanity, of his enemies soon permitted him to return. The remainder of his life was spent in peace. He exerted himself, together with the great S. Basil, to heal the schisms of the distracted Church in Antioch; and he now composed his two unrivalled treatises in assertion of the true doctrine of the humanity of Christ against Apollinaris and his followers, together with his letter to Epictetus, Bishop of Corinth, on the same subject. His last public act was, in Bishop Kaye's opinion, the calling of a Synod at Alexandria in the year 369, in which he wrote to exhort the bishops of Africa to adhere to the Creed of Nicæa, and to pay no attention to that of the Semi-Arians at Ariminum. The exact date of his death is matter of doubt; but, as it would appear, in the year 372 or 373 the Church lost in him the ablest defender of her faith, of his own or perhaps of any other age. He lived to perceive the fallacies which the Arian principles contained within themselves begin to operate to the destruction of the heresy, and to foresee clearly that whenever the imperial support should be finally withdrawn from it, the system would speedily fall.

Bishop Kaye has given his character, as drawn by Gibbon and Cudworth. We prefer, however, to seek it in the pages of S. Gregory Nazianzen, who has dedicated an Oration to the subject, and who, as concerned in the controversies of the times, could, better than any modern, especially a cold-hearted infidel like Gibbon, appreciate his actions and sufferings, his temper and disposition. 'He was,' in the quaint but nervous language of Cave, who has transferred the pith of the Oration to his own pages,—

'He was one that so governed himself, that his life supplied the place of sermons, and his sermons prevented his corrections; much less need had he to cut or lance where he did but once shake his rod. In him all ranks and orders might find something to admire, something particular for their imitation; one might commend his unwearied constancy in fasting and prayer; another his vigorous and incessant persevering in watchings and praise; a third, his admirable care and protection of the poor; a fourth, his resolute opposition of the proud, or his condescension to the humble. The virgins may celebrate him as their bride's-man, the married as their gover-

nor, the hermits as their monitor, the cœnobites as their lawgiver, the simple as their guide, the contemplative as a divine, the merry as a bridle, the miserable as a comforter, the aged as a staff, the youth as a tutor, the poor as a benefactor, and the rich as a steward. He was a patron to the widows, a father to orphans, a friend to the poor, a harbour to strangers, a brother to brethren, a physician to the sick, a keeper of the healthful, one who "became all things to all men, that if not all, he might at least gain the more."... With respect to his predecessors in that see, he equalled some, came near others, and exceeded others; in some he imitated their discourses, in others their actions, the meekness of some, the zeal of others, the patience and constancy of the rest; borrowing many perfections from some, and all from others; and so making up a complete representation of virtue like skilful limners, who, to make the piece absolute, do first from several persons draw the several perfections of beauty within the idea of their own minds; so he, insomuch that in practice he outdid the eloquent, and in his discourses outwent those who were most versed in practice; or, if you will, in his discourses he excelled the eloquent, and in his practice those that were most used to business; and for those that had made but an ordinary advance in either, he was far superior to them, as being eminent but in one kind; and for those who were masters in the other, he outdid them, in that he excelled in both.'—*Cave's Lives of the Fathers*, vol. ii. pp. 358, 359.

With this sketch of the chief actor in it, we dismiss the historical part of our subject. Bishop Kaye's digest of the four Orations of S. Athanasius against the Arians, contains a full analytical account of those remarkable treatises, and is well adapted to give the reader a clear outline of the arguments used in them. This part of his work would, therefore, form a very useful accompaniment to the Orations themselves, either in the Greek of S. Athanasius, or in the translation from it of the 'Library of the Fathers.' Our space will permit us to do no more than glance at one or two particular points in them, which may either appear to be of most importance in themselves, or which have been more particularly illustrated by Bishop Kaye.

S. Athanasius, in these Orations, treats at length of the consequences which follow from the denial of the Co-eternity and Godhead of the Son.[1] He then proceeds to the examination of some of those texts on which the Arians chiefly relied, in proof of their opinions that He was a Creature, and not a Son: *e. g.* Proverbs viii. 22, 23; Heb. i. 4, iii. 2; Acts ii. 36; John xiv. 10, in which, they say, He is declared to have been made, and not begotten; Matthew xxviii. 18; John v. 22, iii. 35, vi. 37; Luke x. 22, which affirm that gifts and powers were given to Him, and prove, they say, that He had them not previously to that bestowal; John xii. 27, xiii. 21; Matthew xxvi. 38, which describe those infirmities and sufferings which they deny to attach to the true Power of God; and John vi. 6, xi. 19; Mark xiii. 32, in which He speaks as if ignorant of what was to be.

[1] Orat. i. §§ 1—51.

To all which S. Athanasius gives the general and obvious answer, that they apply to the assumed Humanity, and not to the natural Divinity of their Subject.[1] In § 22 and following, he opposes to them other texts, which can only be applied to Christ's Godhead; *e.g.* John xiv. 9, 10, xx. 28; Heb. i. 6. From Christ's being always termed γέννημα, or μονογενὴς, as opposed to κτίσμα, S. Athanasius proves[2] that Proverbs viii. 22, ἔκτισέ με, cannot be meant of his Divine Generation, but must apply to His Incarnation, and that the passage was fulfilled in Him when He took flesh. Orat. iii. begins with the proof of the Essential identity of the Father and Son, §§ 1—26. From this he passes on to the more particular consideration of the class of texts above cited, which contain the Arian objections—the bestowal of power on the Son, §§ 26—37; his partial ignorance, §§ 37—50; his growth and increase, §§ 51—53; and his infirmities, §§ 54—58. In a separate piece on Matthew xxi. 27, 'All things are given to Me,' he had treated at length of the communication of graces from the divine to the human nature; and on the subject of Christ's ignorance—as of the last day—he proves that He knew as the Word, what He knew not as Man.

Such, in outline, are the chief contents of the first three Orations. The fourth, as Dr. Newman and Bishop Kaye are agreed, and as is evident in itself, treats chiefly of other heresies than that of Arius; what little it does contain that bears relation to the last being mostly a repetition of the other three.

But the great question, after all, between the Catholics and the Arians is, the reasonableness or otherwise of the objections urged by the latter to the term ὁμοούσιος. These first used the Sonship to deny the Godhead, and then changed their ground and used the Godhead to destroy the Sonship. 'If the Son is God,' they said, 'the Essence is divided, and there are two Gods. If He is the Son, He must be a Creature Who existed not before the time of His Generation, and He cannot, therefore, be God.' Consequently when the Council of Nicæa ruled the ὁμοούσιος, that is, sameness of Essence possessed in different Subjects, they at once turned round and accused the Fathers of holding Division of the Divine Essence. To this S. Athanasius replied, to use Bishop Kaye's words, that

> 'if the objections were well-founded, the Father could not have a Son, notwithstanding the express declaration of Scripture that He has. For a Son must be of the same essence as His Father; and the Father's essence not being divisible, He cannot, on the Arian supposition, have a Son.'[3]

[1] Secs. 51 to the end, and Oration ii. secs. 1—21, and following.
[2] Sec. 44 to the end.
[3] Page 160.

In a word, the Arians denied both the Sonship and the Godhead of Christ; their doctrine was, that in calling Christ a Son, we by the force of terms imply that He is *no* Son, but a Creature, the word Son proving that He existed not before the time of His Generation: and in calling Him God, of One Substance with the Father, we acknowledge two Substances which are in no sense one, and therefore that if both are God, there are two Gods.

The answer to the argument derived from the word Son we have already seen: as to the other, the early Fathers acknowledged such a Communicatio Essentiæ as allowed to the Son (with the Holy Ghost, of Whom there is no question at present) a real and proper Substance. Then, to prevent any Ditheistic conclusion, they taught a Circumincessio or περιχώρησις; that is, such an embosoming of one in the other as is taught by S. John i. 18—'The Only-begotten Son Which is in the bosom of the Father,' and xiv. 9—'He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father,' which makes that Essence, which they hold in one sense three, to be in another sense perfectly and finally one. To hold a ταυτοουσιότης or a μονοουσιότης—a Substance in no sense three, but simply and absolutely one only, is, as S. Epiphanius holds, Sabellianism [1]—would involve, as S. Augustin says, the whole Trinity, instead of One Person only, having been born of the Blessed Virgin. The Father gives to the Son His Own Essence so as to communicate it to Him without depriving Himself of any part of it; just as S. Augustin teaches that He gives Him the Kingdom without taking it from Himself.[2] To cite the words of a few Fathers whose authority is beyond dispute.

S. Hilary: 'Hic ergo Ingenitus ante omne tempus ex se 'Filium genuit, non ex aliqua subjacente materia, quia per 'Filium omnia; non ex nihilo, quia ex se Filium; non ut par-'tum, quia nihil in Deo demutabile aut vacuum est; non partem 'sui vel divisam, vel discissam, vel extensam; quia impassibilis 'et incorporeus Deus est; hæc autem passionis et carnis sunt; 'et secundum Apostolum, in Christo inhabitat omnis plenitudo 'divinitatis corporaliter. Sed incomprehensibiliter inenarra-'biliter, ante omne tempus, et sæcula *Unigenitum ex his quæ* '*ingenita in se erant procreavit*, omne quod Deus est per caritatem 'atque virtutem nativitati ejus impertiens: ac sic ab ingenito, 'perfecto æternoque Patre, Unigenitus et perfectus et æternus 'est Filius.'[3]

S. Ambrose, De Fide, i. x.: 'Incomprehensibiliter gene-'ratur Filius, impassibiliter generat Pater, et tamen ex se

[1] Hær. lxxvi. § 7, p. 920. [2] De Trin. i. § 16. [3] Ibid. iii. § 3.

'generavit et ante omnem intellectum *generavit Deus verus* 'Deum verum.'

S. Augustin, De Trinitate, lib. v., explains the words of S. Paul, Philipp. ii. 6, 'Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God,' of an 'æqualitas secundum substantiam;' and in his treatise De Fide et Symbolo, § 4: 'Deus cum Verbum genuit, *id quod est ipse genuit*, neque de 'nihilo, neque de aliqua jam facta conditaque materia, *sed de* '*seipso id quod est ipse*.'[1]

For the Greek Fathers, Bishop Kaye tells us that, according to Cudworth, SS. Cyril of Alexandria and Gregory of Nyssa held that the three hypostases of the Trinity have no otherwise one and the same Essence of the Godhead in them, nor are one God, than three individual men have one common specifical essence of manhood in them, and are all men. 'I doubt not,' the Bishop continues, 'that if Cyril or Gregory had been 'charged with affirming that there are three Gods, they would 'indignantly have denied the charge.'[2]

Such was the system of the whole Church until the twelfth century, when Peter Lombard first propounded a new theory, based, as Bingham says, on a new definition of the term Person[3] for that generally received, 'an individual substance of a rational nature,' making it merely 'a mode, an office, a habitude, or quality;' in a word, a mere τρόπος ὑπάρξεως, a definition which has since obtained considerable, though not universal, sanction with the Romish theologians. In the fifth Distinction of the first book of Sentences, Lombard raised the question whether we ought to say that because God the Father begot God the Son, God begot God. 'Si enim,' he replies, 'Deus genuit 'Deum, videtur quod *aut* se genuit Deum *aut* alium Deum 'genuerit. Si vero alium Deum genuit, non est tantum unus 'Deus; si autem seipsum Deus genuit, aliqua res seipsam genuit.' He negatives the first from the Doctrine of the Unity, and the second from S. Augustin, De Trin. i. 1.

---

[1] Ed. Bened. tom. vi. p. 153. Venet. 1731.

[2] Page 168, note. Bingham has also said, 'I likewise conclude that Cyril of Alexandria was one of those who allow three particular substances in the Trinity united in one common nature.'—*Sermon on the Trinity*, p. 339.

[3] Bingham, Sermon on the Trinity, p. 330, vol. ix. Straker, 1840. 'Whilst the Fathers speak sense and reason, in allowing the three Persons to be three substances in one sense, as well as one substance only in another, the schoolmen, who deny them to be three real substances in any sense, are justly charged with a contradiction.' 'The latter deny the distinct substances of the Persons, whilst they allow that the Person of the Son is begotten of the Person of the Father, but not his Essence of his Essence; which distinction of a Person from his own proper peculiar Essence is an airy notion that might sufficiently be exposed.'—*Ibid. Sermon* i. pp. 335, 337.

He then raises the question, which was so widely discussed after his time, 'Whether Essence begot Essence, or whether 'Essence neither begot nor is begotten?' and he concludes, 'Nec 'Pater genuit divinam essentiam, nec Divina essentia genuit 'Filium, nec Divina essentia genuit divinam essentiam, hic 'autem nomine essentiæ intelligimus divinam naturam quæ 'communis est tribus Personis et tota in singulis.'[1] This, as our readers will see, is directly opposed to the teaching of S. Ambrose; and also, as Lombard admits, to that of S. Augustin. He endeavours, indeed, to explain away the latter, but we cannot say that, in our judgment, he has at all succeeded. Between his 'aut seipsum genuit, aut alium Deum,'—that is, between Sabellianism and Semi-Arianism, which did hold alius Deus,—there is an evident alternative, and this is found in such communication of Essence by generation as was held by the early Church, and as is taught by Melancthon, cited by Bull in his Defensio: 'Philip Melancthon,' he says, 'in the exposition of 'the Nicene Creed, thinks that it is truly said, The Essence 'which is the Son is born, as it is said in the Creed, "God of 'God, Light of Light;" and to the objection that the same 'thing does not beget itself, so that as the Essence is the same, 'Essence cannot beget Essence, he answers: "The same thing, 'as far as it is incommunicable, does not beget itself; but in that 'it is communicable, it is communicated to Him who is begotten. 'But the Essence is communicable, and it is, therefore, commu-'nicated to Him who is begotten."'[2]

Lombard's doctrine was, however, confirmed in its main position by the fourth Lateran Council, A. D. 1215, and the Council of Florence, 1439. The former says: 'Each of the three 'Persons is that definite Thing, or Essence, or Substance, or 'Divine Nature, which alone is the Principle of all . . . *and* '*this is neither begetter, nor begotten, nor proceeding;* but it is the 'Father Who begets, the Son Who is begotten, the Holy Ghost 'Who proceeds, that there may be differences in the Persons, 'and unity in the Nature, and that thus the Father may be one 'Person, the Son another, and the Holy Ghost another: . . . 'for the Father begetting the Son from Eternity, gave to Him 'his own Essence, as He Himself bears witness, John x. 29—'ὁ πατήρ μου, ὃς δέδωκέ μοι, μείζων πάντων ἐστί[3]—and it cannot 'be said that the Father had given Him a part of His own 'Essence, and kept a part for Himself, for the hypostasis [sub-

[1] Distinct. V.

[2] Defensio, Pars iv. cap. 1, § 9.

[3] The subject of these words, however, is not the Divine Essence, as these Fathers suppose, but the 'sheep' mentioned in verse 28, as our version rightly represents.

'stantia] of the Father is indivisible as being wholly simple. 'Nor can it be said that the Father transferred his own Essence 'to the Son, as if forsooth He' (the Father) 'had so given it to 'Him' (the Son) 'as not to have power over it, for otherwise 'the Father ceased to be a Substance. It is plain, then, that 'without any defect the Son, when begotten, received the 'Essence of the Father, and thus Father and Son have the 'same Essence, and thus Father and Holy Ghost are the 'same thing.'[1]

The Westerns when asked by the Greeks, at the Council of Florence, whether Essence and Person were one and the same thing, answered in like manner: 'We say *Essence and Person 'are one and the same secundum rem, and differ only according to 'our mode of understanding*, so that Person is understood to be 'constituted of Essence and Propriety.' The Proprieties are, they grant, incommunicable, or they would not be Proprieties, and when the Son is begotten by the Father, it is the same, they say, as to assert that He is begotten from the substance of the Father; 'for the Person is the Principle which generates, 'and *the Essence is communicated so that it is not generated.* The 'Father is the Principle which generates, for "Father" implies a 'subject. The Divine Essence is not that which generates, for it 'is not signified as a subject.... but we say that the *Person* of the 'Father is signified, therefore the Person of the Father is that 'which generates; the Essence is the Principle from which 'He generates. The Divine Nature is the Principle by which 'the Father generates the Son, and the Father is not communi-'cated, but the Essence.'[2] The Roman Theologians, however, are by no means unanimous on the subject. Bingham tells us that one of the Schoolmen, Richard (a contemporary of Peter Lombard, and Prior of the order of S. Victor), in his sixth book De Trinitate, defined that 'without doubt the Substance 'of the Son is begotten, the Substance of the Father is un-'begotten; neither is the unbegotten Substance begotten, nor 'the begotten Substance unbegotten,'—and adds that he complained of some who had forsaken the Catholic and primitive doctrine; concluding with a challenge, which will remind the English reader of that of Bishop Jewel—'Let them produce 'authority, I do not say more than one, but at least one, which 'denies that substance begets substance.' Like Jewel's, his challenge was never answered.[3] In fact, the whole gist of the matter lies in this point; if the system of Lombard is correct, the early Fathers opposed the opposite heresies of Arius and

[1] Harduin, vol. vii. p. 17. [2] Session xvi. Harduin, vol. ix. pp. 869, 870.
[3] Bingham, Sermon on the Trinity, pp. 341, 342. Petavius discusses this subject in the 7th Chap. of his 4th Book on the Trinity: he follows Lombard and the Schoolmen in his decision.

Sabellius on grounds that were wholly untenable. Arius held two Substances, but made them *Essentially* different; Sabellius acknowledged one only, but without those Personal distinctions, the absence of which involves the One Person acting on Himself throughout the whole work, both of the Creation and of our Redemption. In consequence, their Catholic opponents taught one Substance, which was both begetter and begotten, by such a distinction at once and union as is expressed by the term ὁμοούσιος, and necessarily implied by that of Perichoresis.

It would seem to be one immediate and inevitable result of the system of Lombard, considered in itself, to confine the doctrine of the Perichoresis to the Persons alone, there being no union possible to that which is in no sense whatever more than one, but is simply and absolutely one, and one only;[1] in which case, among other results, the Doctors of the Church of Rome are, in a great part, divided against themselves, Lombard and the Councils above cited allowing it of the Persons only, S. Thomas Aquinas extending it to the Essence also.[2] It is unquestionable that the voice of antiquity would be with the latter. If (and here the question is at once applicable to the subject before us)—if, to avoid Arianism, we do not admit a generatio essentiæ, we run great risk of falling into Sabellianism; and, accordingly, Bull does not hesitate to accuse Lombard and the fourth Lateran of this very heresy; in that they deny the Son and Holy Ghost, he says, to be Substantial Persons, and make Them no more than mere τρόποι ὑπάρξεως.[3] It seems impossible that a mere protest on their part against being thought to hold that doctrine, can suffice for their acquittal from a conclusion which inevitably follows from their premises.

If, however, the system of Lombard tend to narrow the Perichoresis, the Arians and Semi-Arians denied it altogether, for they denied the doctrine which it expresses, and from which it comes, making the Oneness of the Father and Son to be not of Essence, but of will merely: just as Nestorius afterwards made the Union of the Godhead and Manhood in Christ not a hypostatical, but a moral one. Thus, Eusebius of Cæsarea, in a passage of his Theologia Ecclesiastica, which is enough of itself to stamp him a holder of Arian doctrine, and on which Petavius has severely, but justly, animadverted, says that the Son rests in the Father's bosom, as He promised that we should

[1] So Bingham: 'The Fathers often tell us that the three Persons are united into One Being without confusion; which is a very inconceivable thing upon the hypothesis of one single substance, mind, or spirit; for whatever things are properly united, must be substances really distinct from one another; for there is no proper union of one single substance with itself.'—*Sermon on Trinity*, p. 336.

[2] P. 1. Q. xlii. art. 5. Perrone de Trin. cap. vi. [3] Defensio, p. iv. cap. 1.

rest in the bosoms of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.[1] In another place he says, 'As the Father and Son are One, so are all men 'one; the unity of the Father and Son is not, as Marcellus 'thinks, of the Word made One with God, and joined to Him in 'His Essence. The Father is so in Him as He wills to be in us, 'not that He and the Father are one, *καθ' ὑπόστασιν*, but that 'the Father has given to the Son of His own glory, and He, in 'imitation of the Father, gives it in like manner to His own; as 'He says, John xvii. 22, 23, "The glory which Thou gavest Me, 'I have given them; that they may be one, even as We are one: I 'in them, and Thou in Me, that they may be made perfect in one."'

S. Athanasius, as Bishop Kaye has shown, confutes their doctrine and reasoning more than once and at great length, as containing in itself the essence of their chief heretical proposition, that the Son of God is no Son nor God, but a creature. We can, however, only afford space for the following extract:—

'We cannot be indissolubly united to the Father in essence, as the Son is; but we can take their indissoluble union in Essence as an example of the unity of heart which ought to subsist among believers. If it were possible that we should be as the Son in the Father, it ought to have been written, "that they may be one in Thee, as the Son is in the Father;" whereas our Saviour's words are, "As Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one *in Us*." (John xvii. 21.) The words *in Us* show that He only is in the Father, being the only Word and Wisdom; but we are in the Son, and through Him in the Father. Christ means to say, "that by Our unity they may be one with each other, as We are one by nature and in truth; otherwise they cannot be one, unless they learn in Us what unity is." The words *in Us* do not mean that the disciple is in the Father, as the Son is; but are an example and image, as if it were said, "Let them learn *of Us*." Or again, the words may be understood to mean that they, by the power of the Father and Son, may be one, speaking the same things; for without God this cannot be. In the name of Father and Son being made one, men may hold firm the bond of love. The text, therefore, "that they may be one *as We are*," does not imply identity, but an image and example. The Word, therefore, has really and truly an identity of nature with the Father; it is our part to imitate Him; for He adds, "I in them, and Thou in Me, that they may be made perfect in one." Here the Lord asks something greater and more perfect on our account. It is plain that the Word was made, *γέγονεν*, in us, since He put on our body. He adds, "Thou in Me," for I am Thy Word; and since Thou art in Me, because I am Thy Word, and I am in them through the body, and the salvation of men is perfected through Thee in Me; I ask that they may be made one according to the body in Me and its perfection, that they also may be made perfect, having unity in it, and being made one in it: so that all being borne by Me, may be one body and one spirit, and may grow up to the perfect man. All partaking of the same, are made one body, having the one Lord in themselves. The use of the word *καθὼς*, "as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us," shows that Christ did not mean to express our identity or equality with the Father and Himself, but merely proposes their unity as an example.'—P. 233, &c.

[1] Eccles. Theol. ii. 19, § 5, p. 86, folio.

Again:—

'Athanasius produces, in support of his interpretation, 1 John iv. 13: "Thereby we know that we dwell in Him, and He in us, because He hath given us of His Spirit." We, therefore, are in Him, and He in us, by the grace of the Spirit given to us; and as the Spirit is the Spirit of God, therefore we, having the Spirit, are reckoned to be in God; and thus God is in us. We are not in the Father, as the Son is in the Father: we are in Him by partaking of the Spirit: but the Son does not receive of the Spirit, He supplies the Spirit to all: nor does the Spirit unite the Word to the Father, but the Spirit receives from the Word.'—Pp. 236, 237.

To conclude the subject of the ὁμοούσιος, we will briefly observe, although it is beyond the strict limits of our question, that the Arians of S. Augustin's time, feeling the pressure of the original Arian system, admitted the Nicene ὁμοούσιος in word, but held another doctrine in fact; viz. that the Son was of one Substance with God in the same sense as that held by the Manichees and others, of the souls of men; who thought, not that these were of equal infinity and majesty with Him, but that they were created out of His Substance, and were thus consubstantial with Him.

The last point that remains for our notice is Bishop Kaye's account of S. Athanasius' treatise 'De Incarnatione.' We are glad to see this piece thus popularly brought forward. We know of none, in the whole course of early theology, which contains, for its length, so simple and lucid an account of the Divine Purpose and method of acting, in the schemes of our creation and redemption, or which more satisfactorily answers those questions as to particular portions of the Divine Œconomy, *e. g.* the *modus operandi* of vicarious sacrifice, and of the death and resurrection of Christ, which every inquiring mind may and ought to ask. Especially would its study, we think, be useful in these days of missionary activity, as showing how the author dealt with those who were yet strangers to the Christian covenant, Jews or Gentiles.

The 'De Incarnatione' commences with a statement of the Scripture account of the creation, as opposed to the notions of the philosophers.[1] The author then shows that man was placed in paradise in a state of original righteousness, with a promise, if he continued obedient, of immortality, without death, in heaven.[2] But the law was broken, and henceforth it became a question as to what, in the counsels of God, should become of him. Death had been threatened if he sinned, and it was unfitting that God should fail in the fulfilment of His word. Repentance alone could not have satisfied Him, because there was not only a sin to be wiped out, for which it might have

[1] Kaye, p. 283. [2] Ibid. p. 284.

sufficed, but also an indwelling corruption which it had no power to purify.[1]

To heal this corruption the Son of God, Himself God, came down, in the nature of His creature, to rescue him by His own arm from his enemy, and by engrafting him into that purity which, existing not in Him in degree, must be of more power to cleanse and to save, than the lust of the betrayer had been to pollute and to destroy, He renovated His work, not Himself suffering from the pollution of the body; but, by taking a body to be a part of Himself, and uniting it to His all-powerful and all-spotless Godhead, He purified it.[2]

Lastly, there was not only restoration to be bestowed, but a penalty for a wilful transgression to be paid; and that penalty was death. Here again the justice of God was amply satisfied by the death of His only-begotten Son, in whose death this penalty was paid far more completely than it could have been paid in the deaths of all men.[3] So much for that death in itself: the next thing to be considered is the manner of it. He who was Life and the Lord of life could not die of infirmity; nor could the Healer of diseases die of disease: again, He must not die a private death of which few could know; nor must He inflict death on Himself: His death must be public, to show both that He had verily died, and also to prove the truth of His resurrection: and it must be the work of others; of this the cross was the most fitting instrument, both as it was part of the curse that He must bear, and also as by it were fulfilled His own declarations, Isaiah lxv. 2, Rom. x. 21, John xii. 32, and Ephes. ii. 2, and other like passages which point to the disarming of the power of Satan.

His death had this further power, that it destroyed death, and changed it evermore into dissolution or sleep, as is shown from the expressions of the Apostles, Philipp. i. 23, 2 Cor. v. 1, 2 Pet. iii. 11, 12.

As regards the time that He remained in the grave:—He might have despised the power of death, and raised His body at once had He so pleased, but men might then have said that He had not truly died, and the glory of the incorruptibility might have been obscured.

Hence the Word underwent death that His body might be seen to be dead, and on the third day He showed it to all incorruptible: had He risen later, it would not have been believed that He had raised up the same body which had died,—nor would He keep His disciples longer in suspense,—but, whilst His words were yet fresh in their ears, and whilst

[1] Kaye, pp. 284, 285. [2] Ibid. p. 288. [3] Ibid. pp. 288—294.

those who put Him to death were on earth to testify of it, He showed the body that had been dead immortal and incorruptible. Thus it might be known that He had died not through weakness of the nature of the indwelling Word, but that by the power of that Word death had been destroyed in Him.

S. Athanasius thus adduces the moral change that has since taken place in the nature of man, as a proof that Christ has risen and is living still:—

'Before Christ came, death was formidable even to holy men; now, even women and youths disregard it. In like manner the daily conversions of the Gentiles to the truth of Christ; the influence exerted over the thoughts and consciences of men, so that the adulterer, the murderer, the unjust, the blasphemer forsake their evil courses, and submit to the teaching of Christ; the expulsion of evil spirits by His very name; these all prove that He is not dead, but that He has risen from the dead, and lives, or, rather, is the Life. He cannot be dead, who daily performs so many acts; drawing men to piety, persuading them to virtue, teaching them concerning immortality, leading them to the desire of heavenly things, inspiring them with power against death, showing Himself to every one, and destroying the impiety of idolatry. The works which the Son of God daily works for the salvation of men are the proof of His resurrection.'[1]

And if unbelievers object that Christ has not risen because they do not see Him, they object to that which is according to nature, for God is by nature invisible—and if their minds are blind, they can see with their eyes the proofs of His being alive, *i.e.* His works—as a blind man, though he cannot see the sun, feels its influence, and knows that it is in heaven—nor would the devils, who can see what we cannot, obey Him if they did not know Him to be alive, and therefore their obedience is a proof of His life, and of His having raised His own body, and of His being the true Son of God and from Him, as His own Word, Wisdom, and Power.

Lastly, he applies the Prophets to the confutation of the Jews, and the *argumentum ad hominem* to that of the Gentiles:—

'The former ought to have learned from their own Scriptures that the Messiah was to be born of a Virgin, and to assume the nature of man, and to be Lord of all; that His birth was to be announced by the appearance of a star; that He would be called out of Egypt; that He would suffer every kind of indignity, and would not only die, but die upon the Cross; that He would rule over the Gentiles; that He would restore sight to the blind, and cause the lame to walk. All these predictions were fulfilled in Jesus of Nazareth, and in none other. The Jews appear to have admitted that these prophecies applied to the Messiah, but to have denied that they were fulfilled in Jesus, and to have said that they still looked for the promised Saviour. In confutation of this objection, Athanasius alleges Daniel's prophecy of the seventy weeks, and the prediction of Jacob, from both of which it was clear that the time appointed for the appearance of the Messiah had passed.'[2]

[1] Kaye, p. 300.

[2] Ibid. p. 301.

The heathen Pantheists are told of the inhabiting, by the Word, of a human body, in order to make use of it as an instrument to convey the knowledge of God to man; and that where sin had abounded, *i.e.* in the human body, there grace might abound more.

'The Word was made man, in order that we may be deified; He manifested Himself through the body, in order that we may attain to the idea of the Invisible Father; He suffered contumely from man, in order that we may inherit immortality. He sustained no injury, it is true, being impassible, incorruptible, the very Word and God; but He keeps and preserves suffering mankind, for whom He underwent these sufferings, by His own impassibility.'[1]

And S. Athanasius ends with an exhortation to all to purify their hearts and lives according to the doctrine of Christ and the example of the saints; that they may thus read the Scriptures with profit, and, as far as is possible, attain to the knowledge of God.

In conclusion, we can only again congratulate our readers on the appearance of a volume which contains much that is of real value, and the study of which may benefit so many. It is not sufficient that fundamental truths should be stated once or twice only, and then be considered as fully vindicated; it is well that they be repeated from time to time in a form adapted to the needs and requirements of the age; and as far as Bishop Kaye has done this, he has fulfilled the apostolic injunction to hand down the form of sound words, and has done his duty as a good and faithful ruler of the Church of God.

[1] Kaye, p. 304.

ART. V.—*History of Europe, from the Fall of Napoleon in* 1815, *to the Accession of Louis Napoleon in* 1852. *By* SIR ARCHIBALD ALISON, Bart. Blackwood: Edinburgh.

To speak of the vast differences in dignity and importance between one subject and another, in the wide range of literature, may very easily end in mere verbiage. The remark acquires more force, if we note the different attitudes which the mind, often unconsciously, assumes towards any particular study. There are certain subjects to which in themselves men yield a general homage,—there are others wherein the mind preserves an impartial independence,—others on which it looks down with a careless indifference. No author perhaps obtains a wider hearing, or is listened to with a spirit of readier docility, than the historian;—men are often disposed to pay only too much deference to the dignity of his office. The reader may suffer from doing so; but it furnishes a solemn caution for the historian, to take heed how he uses the pen of the ready writer. He is only the more deeply responsible for what he says, if he knows, that for the vast majority of his readers, 'to hear is to believe,' often also to 'obey.' The wider too the subject which he takes in hand, the stronger is the antecedent influence which he exercises over them. The historian of a nation, yet more of many nations, sits on a more exalted judgment-seat, and vindicates for his words a far wider acceptance than men would dream of giving to the narrow and local lucubrations of the chronicler of a county.

Sir A. Alison has sought to take his stand on a very lofty height; and his former historical work will obtain a wide circulation for this its sequel, and perhaps win from many a simple and trusting adoption of the views contained in it. It remains, however, to be seen whether the present volume will not have the effect of diminishing his influence, and of throwing some doubt on the general soundness of his opinions. Meanwhile, the very popularity of his preceding history will procure for many an erroneous notion, or false conclusion, in the present one, a more general acceptance than would have been accorded to them if the other had not gone before, to shed a portion of its own light on its successor. The great reputation of the earlier work is accounted for without much difficulty. A lively and vigorous narrative of a period more full of rapid and stirring change and momentous events than any other in the

world's history, deserved the popularity which it won; and the same merit will doubtless again be discerned in those portions of the present work, which may draw forth the especial powers of a writer whose facility in narration far exceeds his profoundness as a thinker, or his wisdom as a judge. His deficiency in these respects is unfortunately brought out by the very character of the period of which he has in the present instance undertaken to write the history. Unlike the former, it is a time of quiet; not less full, however, of change, or of changes less momentous; but one requiring (if we may resort to comparisons which are often only misleading) the deep sagacity of Thucydides, in a far greater degree than the superficial brilliancy of Livy. Here and there only is a gleam of the vivid light which casts such unnatural splendour on the previous age of turmoil and violence; and only in such transient glimpses are the real powers of the author made manifest. The last romantic episode in the chivalrous career of Murat is conveyed in language very different from that which records the gradual workings of national legislature and public opinion.

Still it is a subject which more fully than the former reveals the writer's mind, and his own individual convictions; and it does in fact display an array of notions, and a system of philosophy, very greatly at variance with those which are acknowledged by any considerable numbers at the present day. So complete an isolation from any of the ordinary opinions of the time, might scarcely have been anticipated; at all events, far greater power of argument, and depth of analysis, and originality of thought, might reasonably have been looked for. Such preconceptions we had formed before coming to the perusal of this volume: and though it would have been vain to look for any entire concurrence in his conclusions, we had expected to encounter the vigour and energy of a keen antagonist, the force and impartiality of (to say the least), a candid and independent thinker; we had invested him with all the dignity wherewith the heated imagination of the Knight of La Mancha invested his 'Windmill' foes; we can scarcely do more than confess that our deception may not have been so signal as that of the would-be restorer of chivalry.

The inference might suggest itself, that to refute the erroneous assertions and opinions of such a writer, would be a superfluous labour. In part only would such a conclusion be true. Certain, indeed, it is, that far the greater portion of the mistakes and prejudices contained in this volume, will never produce any harvest;—their own weight will crush them; but amongst these strange notions and preconceptions there are some which will win a more ready hearing. They too will one

day come to nothing; but they chime in with too much of the present popular feeling—they are too much in accordance with the present amount of general knowledge, to be altogether effete now. There is only too much in Sir A. Alison's new history, to entitle it to be named a repository of exploded notions, of fancies in which few take interest, of judgments on numerous points altogether behind the information looked for at the hands of any writer of the present day.

Much has been said and written about the historian's office. So long as it is kept within its own proper bounds, it can scarcely be magnified too highly. The vindicator of right and justice, the handmaid of True Philosophy, History leads to that region of higher Wisdom, which 'it may not enter, but to which it for ever points the way.' Such was its estimate in the mind of one than whom few have had a truer or a stronger perception of its nature, however much his own foregone conclusions may have clouded his apprehension of its teaching. Is it too much to say, that of this its lofty office, of this its sacred work, Sir A. Alison has a very faint and uncertain perception? It is a hard thing to assert this of another; but his own words seem to convey this lower idea and estimation of it. Can we speak otherwise, when it is asserted, that the fall of the Roman empire, the destruction of ancient civilization, the extinction of the life of the old world, was not owing to widespread corruption, to tyranny long since grown intolerable, to a pestering mass of moral and physical misery and degradation, not to utter lifelessness in religion, to an entire abnegation of their allegiance to God, and to a refusal to recognise all things as His, to a luxurious and despotic Atheism in the rich, to a desperate and enslaved superstition in the poor? The idea that these were the causes contributing to its dire catastrophe, Sir A. Alison has branded as a delusion:—it is a mere mistake to think so.

'The fall of the Roman empire,' he affirms, 'so long ascribed in *ignorance* to slavery, heathenism, and moral corruption, was in reality brought about by a decline in the gold and silver mines of Spain and Greece, from which the precious metals for the circulation of the world were drawn, at the very time when the victories of the legions, and the wisdom of the Antonines, had given peace and security, and with it an increase in number and riches, to the Roman Empire.'—P. 31.

We may, indeed, hope that the meaning was not present to the mind of the writer, as he penned this passage; but the whole of it leaves a strong impression that he considered a continued supply of this precious material would have averted the impending ruin, or rather that but for this failure ruin was not impending at all. We are to suppose, then, that so long as

the supply of gold and silver does not fail, moral corruption and physical degradation, lawless tyranny and boundless oppression, in fine, a chaos of moral disorder, will not by its direct working bring about the utter overthrow of any nation or people; that the very riches which men have misused, the very powers of nature to which they have yielded a crouching and terrified submission, would not themselves be made the instruments of their destruction. This is indeed but the first opening up of one leading and grand idea of the paramount influence of the precious metals over the happiness and well-doing of mankind, which seems well-nigh, to the exclusion of any other, to occupy the writer's mind.

Into the questions of political economy, which the discussion of this subject involves, we do not propose to enter,—not, however, from any disposition to undervalue their importance, or to understate the influence which they exercise on the conduct of human affairs; but because there are higher points, affecting our judgment on things of far greater moment, in which Sir A. Alison has pronounced a verdict yet further removed from the standard of a true and correct decision. His verdict is indeed on all subjects enunciated with the most absolute authority;—but it may be questioned, whether many minds could be found to harmonize with the mind of the writer from whom these despotic declarations proceed. Failing such harmony, this parade of authority is fruitless. Undoubtedly, many could be found to sympathise with some portion of the author's opinions and theories; but then these same would as certainly be completely at variance with other notions and dogmas to which he adheres with equal pertinacity. Doubtless he might find in far too great abundance men who would go along with him in his application of a theory of persecution,—a theory by no means modified like that which Dr. Arnold was prepared to advocate, but extending to very summary arguments of fire and sword. The theory is very old, and its sway has been a very wide one—far too wide, far too prevailing still. Unfortunately it has this inconvenience attached to it, that it affords as much justification to the terrific career of Mahommed as to the more orthodox bombardment of Algiers by Lord Exmouth. Men are willing enough to receive the major premise, that the truth may sometimes require to be propagated by the sword; they are still more willing to supply, as the second step, 'My convictions are true:' failing the existence of any court recognised by all mankind as having power to decide onthese momentous assertions, it is difficult to grant to one persuasion the right of employing an argument which is peremptorily refused to others.

'Christianity, indeed,' says Sir A. Alison, in his exulting peroration on the theological importance of the victory of Algiers, 'is destined to spread *mainly* by its winning the hearts of men; but in a world of selfishness and violence, it is not thus alone that mankind are to be converted, even to their own blessing. The first entrance must be sometimes won by conquest; and he who bears even the olive-branch and cross in one hand, may often despair of success, if he is not prepared, when necessary, to grasp the naked sword in another.'—P. 155.

It is not customary to employ troops for such a purpose; but the passage suggests the propriety of attaching a battalion or two to our most important scenes of missionary operations. The physical argument, not dimly looming, but fearfully visible behind, might give spurs to sluggishness in the apprehension of the truth. But the subject is one far too solemn for raillery;—we may well mourn that the historian has so lowered his own office, that he has so witnessed against the truth with which his words should ever sound in unison, so outraged the upbraiding voice of the heart for the sake of a sounding sentence, or a majestic climax. We never remember meeting with a writer whose expressed opinions so frequently clash with each other, so nearly approach to a contradiction in terms, even when he is speaking of entirely different topics. His theory of persecution, *mutatis mutandis*, would have found him wonderful favour with the founder of the false faith of Islam; it was precisely *his* idea that his religion was to be spread mainly by persuasion—failing this, by the strong arm, and the sharp sword. Yet, strange to tell, with this kind of argument in religion, we find him as strenuous in asserting, that 'purely political offences should not be punished with death.'

'Death,' he says, 'should be reserved for great moral crimes, concerning which all mankind are agreed, as murder, fire-raising, or violent robbery; and not extended to acts such as those of treason, which originate not in moral wrong, but in difference of political opinion, and are sometimes justified by necessity, or rewarded by the highest fortune or lasting admiration of mankind.'—P. 305.

Without controversy, or maintaining the proposition ourselves, we may say that few subjects assume such different aspects when viewed in the details of particular cases. In all practical conclusions, indeed, these τὰ καθ' ἕκαστα must guide and control the judgment; and on the question of purely political offences, they do exercise an especial and extraordinary influence. The crime of treason, indeed, is one which we may stigmatise as the execrable wickedness of a murderer or a ruffian, the selfish schemes of a wily and ambitious plotter, meeting with its most just reward, if overtaken by the most signal overthrow; or we may extol it as the brave and uncalculating sacrifice of temporal interest or public reputation to a

heroic sense of right and duty. The actor in it may come before us invested with all the dignity of a sufferer in a righteous cause, his career may be illuminated in our eyes with the halo of old associations, with the magic of a time-honoured name, and the memories of fallen greatness—with the sanction of ancient jurisdiction, repudiated by those over whom it was exercised, never abandoned by those who possessed it. It may be thus; or the act may appear to us simply the struggle of violence, to overthrow order, and reap a harvest of unholy gain from the wreck of law and justice; our hearts may now bleed with an agony of sympathy for the high-souled warrior, who has grasped his sword to fight for the descendant of a line of kings, to do battle for him whom he deems the anointed of Heaven, the sovereign to whom alone his fealty is owing,—or with a sense of horror, and yet with unquestioning acquiescence, we may contemplate the doom of one who, for his own gain, or his own lust of pride and power, has overthrown kingdoms, made the father childless, and the child an orphan. Sir A. Alison, in enunciating this principle, was contemplating instances which belong to the latter class rather than to the former. He is speaking of Ney and Labedoyere, and of the few others who suffered (to use his own words), 'for a rebellion which dethroned 'the king, caused the conquest of the country, and fixed a debt 'of 64,000,000*l.* on its inhabitants.' And yet, in the calm solemnity of the judicial chamber, Marshal Ney ought not to be visited with a penalty, which may be inflicted indiscriminately on thousands in battles to be fought for the spread of Christianity. But Sir A. Alison, in the conclusion of his third chapter, has happily furnished a sufficient antidote for the strange principle which we have already quoted from the termination of the second. To shed the blood of such purely political offenders on the scaffold 'is' (he tells us), 'the same injustice and the same 'error as to burn for heresy. Opinion is not the proper object 'of punishment; it is acts only that are; and the appropriate 'punishment for acts tending to dispossess the government is 'to dispossess the person attempting it.'—(P. 506.)

We will gladly assume this to be the more real expression of the author's mind; and certainly to be charged with careless and rambling writing, is a less matter than to be guilty of tampering with the high standard of Christian practice. But it is not here only that the writer shows himself not very sensitive on the subject of a just and righteous legislation. Except on this supposition, it seems difficult to account for his opinion, that 'the ostracism of Athens, the banishment of Rome, were 'wise and humane institutions, had they not been often abused 'by a tyrant majority.' (P. 330.) Is it not in itself an evil

thing to inflict any penalty, however slight, on a man who has undergone no trial either present or absent? Would it not be an argument especially against ostracism—not that it *may* be abused, but that it *must* be?

It is no part of our purpose to inflict on our readers a review of the whole of this volume. Such an examination would certainly run to a greater length than the volume itself, if it were really our desire to analyse and to refute all the mistakes and fallacies to be found throughout it. The fact, therefore, that we have lightly touched on some, must by no means convey the impression that none remain unmentioned, or even that those which we have not space to notice are of a less serious nature than the few which may come under examination. His strange judgments on the subject of education,—his marvellous inference that the injunction of our Lord to '*preach* the Gospel to all nations' was not a command to *educate* all nations,—his heedless assertion that the growth of crime has been in direct ratio to the increase of *education* (an assertion false from its very heedlessness, resting as it does entirely on the equivocal use of the word);—all this might appear to call for a lengthened refutation, were it not that the obvous falsity and strangeness of such talk will be the best remedy for the mischief which the spread of such ideas would involve.

Common-place reflections and trite observations are especially acceptable to a certain class of writers; they furnish their natural element of thought. Whatever be the subject on which they desire to speak, they find it equally easy to string together what may seem to them very pertinent and appropriate reflections, which yet, in the judgment of others, are either irrelevant or unnecessary. In this mould Sir A. Alison's mind seems to be cast,—we will not say because he is one of those, the utter dulness of whose thoughts proceed from their inability to perceive any difficulty, or measure the depth of any subject; although such a conclusion might appear to be justified by his proneness to garnish his pages with maxims and reflections long since worn threadbare, and to enunciate at every favourable opportunity certain cherished theories of his own. These constantly recurring notions lead him often into a questionable morality, and not unfrequently (as in the assertion respecting the fall of the Roman Empire) to falsify the teaching of history. But if he sometimes falls greatly short of the rightful standard of the historian's office, he has not less signally erred in his estimate of its extent. 'Ne sutor ultra crepidam,' is a maxim which (if there be any truth in it at all) must apply as much to the historian as to any one else. Sir A. Alison has, of his own free will, greatly widened the field of

history, and cannot therefore complain if he is weighed in a different balance, and met by a more scrutinising criticism. It is undoubtedly the rightful task of the historian to draw an accurate and faithful picture of the particular time about which he has undertaken to write;—his work would be as imperfect if he were altogether silent on the subjects of science, art, and manners, as if he confined himself wholly to the delineation of a nation's internal policy, without any reference to its relations with the world beyond itself. Accordingly, we have no reason to be surprised, at finding one of his chapters entitled the 'Progress of Literature, Science, the Arts and Manners, in Great Britain after the Peace.' But it may well be questioned, whether the particular method of treatment adopted in this instance, has ever been considered incumbent on a writer of a history not exclusively devoted to this topic. If this mode of handling it be right in principle, then the historian's work in this province is to enumerate carefully every single invention, and describe every form of manufacture,—to give a sketch and criticise all the works of every single author, whether of poetry or of fiction, of history or philosophy, throwing in as much personal description as possible,—to delineate the various schemes set forth by all political economists, the progress of inquiry throughout the wide range of physical science,—to describe at length every species of current literature, reviews, newspapers, &c., with something like a memoir of every famous critic, essayist and historian, of writers of novels and writers of satire, of biographers and travellers, of painters and architects, with a disquisition on the principles of the arts of architecture, painting, and sculpture, and the important works wrought in each kind, —to exhibit the state of the drama, and the characteristics of the celebrated actors and actresses, with the tone of society in general, and the various influences at work within it. Nay, if all this be necessary, surely much more is necessary. Many items must be added, before the catalogue can be considered complete. And here we have a very gigantic and herculean task indeed,—a perfect pyramid of labours, by the side of which the physical exploits of the Son of Alcmena almost dwindle into nothing. All these topics, so wide in their range, so multifarious in their subjects,—are to be discussed within the limits of a single chapter of ninety-eight by no means closely printed octavo pages,—a single paragraph being required to do the duty almost of a volume. If this be indeed but an incidental portion of the historian's work, no wonder that the writer has fallen very far short of the mark. Our hearts would be hard indeed, if we imputed blame because his shoulders refused to bear the intolerable burden, which long-established usage sought to impose on them. If such a performance were expected, the

only praise possible would be to have made a respectable failure. But no such expectations are formed; and Sir A. Alison's failure can scarcely be deemed respectable. He has undertaken a task not congenial to himself, or rather one indefinitely beyond him, to confess his inadequacy for which need never bring a blush into his cheek, or excite the least feeling of shame in a writer of profounder mind, and far more extensive learning. But the present writer is very far indeed from making any such confession. There is not the slightest intimation of his having felt the least difficulty in commencing what one might have supposed would be so enormous a labour. He evidently considers himself perfectly well qualified for the task. Like Johnson, in discussing coining he would fain be thought to have been bred in the Mint; and his ambition is to be so familiar with the mash-tub as to be taken for having been bred a brewer. He has enough in himself of the manufacturer, the poet, the novelist, the geologist, the painter, the architect, the historian, the chemist, the biographer, the essayist, the reviewer, the sculptor, the political economist,—to pass decisive judgment on every one of them, as well as on the principles of their art or science, to weigh their work, and assign to each the niche which he must occupy in the Walhalla of the World.

Far be it from us to face the portentous mountain over which Sir A. Alison, 'pede libero,' moves with so much facility and grace. Our slender powers do not enable us with him to sit 'like Zeus upon his high Thessalian hill,' while gods and men pass in rapid array before us, giving the most exact estimate of the work and the character of each. We can but dwell very briefly on some one or two of the details of this magnificent phantasmagoria of science, theology, and art: to say nothing of 'other fashionable topics, such as pictures, taste, Shakspere, and the musical glasses.'

The writer has already propounded his opinion, that persecution may be, under certain circumstances, a very good thing: we must accept the conclusion that war is a very good thing also; at all events, that it is nothing like the evil which it is held to be,—because directly from it spring all the wonders of art and science which have shed so dazzling a lustre on this present century; because to it we owe that marvellous array of poets and philosophers which the generation immediately preceding the present one regarded with such astonished admiration; because to it is to be ascribed the temporary (for it can be no more than temporary) liberation of men from the all-absorbing selfishness, which is the 'upas-tree' of his existence — the 'greatest weakness and radical curse of humanity.'

It is an unfortunate circumstance, that, whenever it is necessary to refute any position of the present writer, we have to

unravel the whole thread of his argument, the error lying often in some false step taken in the midst of it,—or in some equivocation which is not apparent at the outset. And so it is here. War, we are told, is a benefit, *because* man thereby becomes less selfish, because—

'He is obliged, by the approach of danger, to extend his view to the furthest parts of the horizon; to become interested in remote and future events; to sympathise with the fortunes of men in distant lands. The actors in war, indeed, are often selfish, rapacious, hard-hearted; though many among them are noble, generous, devoted. But the sufferers under it are actuated in general by the generous emotions. Among them is to be found the patience which endures suffering, the heroism which braves danger, the patriotism which sacrifices self to country.'—P. 415.

This statement is strangely one-sided and equivocal: Sir A. Alison may accept whichever epithet he prefers. He speaks of the actors in a war without in the least distinguishing between them. Are they aggressors, or acting in self-defence? are they fighting from lust for power; or from a sense of duty, to guard all that is sacred and dear to them? He speaks of the war itself: does he keep distinct the *scene* of the war, and the nations who from a distance send their contributions of men and money to carry it on? These are points on which not a word is said; and yet surely in them lies the gist of the matter, otherwise the nearer men are to the scene of action—if war is not only knocking at their doors, or looming grimly in the distance, but making havoc of their hearths and homes—these generous emotions and unselfish feelings ought only to be experienced the more keenly. Will this assertion be borne out by the truth of facts? If English science, and art, and literature received such immense and unparalleled additions as a direct consequence of the last continental war, why were not these effects yet more conspicuous and general in Spain, the dark theatre of its most tragic scenes, where resistance was the fiercest, and hatred most obstinate even in despair? why was not the like brilliant result produced in Italy, or Austria, or Russia—why not even in France? England was at no time the scene of the war; the dark cloud of invasion hung for awhile over the horizon, and then it vanished away. True it is, the hearts of hundreds and thousands beat fearfully and tremblingly for those dear to them who were fighting manfully in the land of the stranger; but in no other sense than this were the inhabitants of Great Britain sufferers under the war. A more specious argument might present itself to one who desired to prove that the increased activity of intellect manifested at that time was brought about and nourished by a romantic excitement, produced by a danger which did not immediately affect them—not that such an assertion would be true—but it might be made to exhibit a more plausible colouring than the

other, with less equivocation in words. The author blames those who assert war to be 'a universal and unmitigated evil.' Certainly it is not so: nowhere is evil victorious in the struggle which it has so long been waging against all that is good. With thankfulness we may say, that God has not suffered anything to produce results of unmixed wrong, or even to be wholly evil in its working. True, also, it is that what is in itself evil can only bring forth evil issues; but this would only show that so far as war is caused by the sin of men, its only tendency is to multiply sin; all the good which follows *after*, not *from* it, is owing to the elements of good involved in the struggle which has been caused by human sinfulness. This is but saying, in other words, that the apparent is not always the real cause of any given effect.

A few pages are devoted to a cursory view of the progress of science in the application of steam to locomotion and manufactures, and of the increased tastefulness in designs displayed in the useful arts; on which latter point the author reveals his worship of ancient forms, and his recognition of them as the sole models for present imitation; and then, in long array, the whole phalanx of recent authors is made to pass before his tribunal. Whatever may have been their work—however wide in its extent, however profound and abstruse their researches—of each and all he declares himself to be a fitting and competent judge. The qualities which form a great historian, he tells us, would equally secure him preeminence in the arts of painting and of sculpture. The practical corollary from the whole chapter is, that a man who undertakes to write a history becomes, *ipso facto*, a judge in every province of universal knowledge, and bound to exercise his judicial functions in each and all of these. In that trusting spirit which looks forward from the present to the future, he contemplates the time when his decisions shall be received as conclusive on the merit of the various writers of the present day. Those whom he thinks fit to mention will have each their niche in the temple of fame; they who are not so fortunate as to win that honour, will vanish into thin air,—they will become mere names, if even that empty relic still survive of them. Surely every one would say that, if this be so, the historian will have exercised these mighty powers with most religious and careful impartiality; and great writers on moral philosophy, or theology, or any other subject, will have each their due meed of praise assigned to them in a chapter which diligently records the colour of an actor's hair, and the smoothness of an actress's skin (p. 503). Any one who takes up this chapter with such a preconception, will probably arrive at a different conclusion before he reaches the close of it.

First in the solemn procession comes Sir Walter Scott. Two or three meagre pages suffice to examine his voluminous works. For quantity of space allotted to him we have but little reason to complain. Many, as great in other ways, have less,—some whose names have acquired no slight renown, fail of obtaining any. His chief title to fame, in the writer's opinion, is 'the elevated strain of his mind' and writings. 'It was on the 'noble, whether in high or low life, that his affections were 'fixed: the ordinary was delineated only as a set-off to its lustre. 'Thence his enduring fame, thence his passport to immortality. 'Nothing ever permanently floated down the stream of time 'but what was buoyant from its elevating tendency.' Sir A. Alison draws, both here and elsewhere, a very marked distinction between the ordinary and extraordinary in life, and seems to look with the most profound indifference, and even contempt, upon the former. Crabbe's reputation is declared to be fast declining,—nay, to be almost gone; the reason given (almost in the same words as before, for Sir A. Alison is fond of repeating himself) being, 'that they want the lofty spirit, the elevating tendency, which is the only passport to immortality.' Crabbe is certainly hard, almost to repulsiveness; but in many cases, it must be allowed, not from want of interest and pathos in his subject. His faults, and they are not slight, must be sought for elsewhere. So, too, Mr. Warren—Mr. Samuel Warren, in the Temple of Fame—

'like so many romance-writers of the age, has often filled his canvas with pictures of middle and humble life, to an extent which those whose taste is fixed on the elevating and the lofty will not altogether approve. But this is the fault of the age rather than the man. It is amply redeemed, even in the eyes of those who regard it as a blemish, by the gleams of genius which shine through the dark clouds of melancholy with which his conceptions are so often invested; by the exquisite pathetic scenes with which they abound; and the pure and ennobling objects to which his compositions, *even* when painting ordinary life, are uniformly directed.'—P. 487.

If the employment of a very ordinary phrase may be excused, these passages might not unjustly be termed 'clap-trap.' If it really be the fault of this age to value the delineations of ordinary life, and in any degree to recognise its importance and its real sacredness, we can only say that it is a most excellent fault, and that its increase is very much to be wished for. The author is fond of sounding sentences, and of conveying, by means of antithesis, statements between which it is very difficult to discover any real opposition. It is not easy to perceive any in his opinion of Sir W. Scott, that—

'no man ever threw a more charming radiance over the traditions of ancient times; but none ever delineated in a nobler spirit the virtues of the present. . . . . It has been truly said that the influence of his writings neutralized, to a certain extent, the effect of the Reform Bill; but it is not less true that no one ever contributed more powerfully to that purification—

without which all others are nugatory—the reform of the human heart. —P. 423.

The passage looks very profound; but it seems impossible to say why the one fact should be considered as standing in the way of the other. This style moreover is everywhere obscured by a mere redundancy of words, and the complicated construction of sentences. One of many instances may be taken from his observations on Dr. Lingard:—

'However much we may pride ourselves on the liberty of our constitution, and the manner in which, under the influence of unbounded freedom of discussion, truth is elicited from the collision of opposite opinions, there is nothing more certain than, not only that it is not immediately that this effect takes place, but that centuries may often elapse before the most important transactions are represented in their real colours.'—P. 454.

It would be useless to note one by one the peculiar and strange criticisms on different writers to be found in this chapter. The author speaks much of want of imagination as causing the failure of many poets. We are tempted to conclude, that the faculty is not especially strong in himself. Many passages which he quotes as examples of the highest beauty, are in no way deserving of such marked distinction. Few perhaps would expect to find Shakspeare, the most natural, and Gray, the most artificial, of poets, coupled together for any purpose. Yet we are told that, with the exceptions of these two poets, there is no writer 'of whom so many 'ideas and lines have been riveted in the general mind of his 'country,' as Campbell. The fact is true of the latter, whatever it may be of Gray; but it is a perilous chance, on which to rest the well-doing of mankind, if, as the author asserts, 'we may despair of the species when the admiration for the '"Pleasures of Hope" begins to decline.' (P. 430.) To us it seems very poor praise indeed to assert, of such magnificent lyrics as Hohenlinden and the Battle of the Baltic, that 'they 'have all the terseness and felicity of expression, which have 'rendered Horace immortal,' and mere absurdity to place in the same list with these matchless songs his effusions on 'painting,' 'the Last Man,' or 'the Rainbow.' Ancient art and ancient poetry is a sacred subject with the author, not to be rashly criticised or tampered with; his unbounded and indiscriminating respect for *τὰ πρὶν πελώρια*, finds in them excellences which others have been slow of discovering. The secret of Virgil's success, the guarantee for the permanence of his fame, was, we are told, his 'profound knowledge of the human heart.' The judgment which Virgil passed on his own poem, by his request that it might be destroyed, is more faithful and more true than that of Sir A. Alison. To those who think of his Eclogues, such praise will sound almost like satire. Virgil knew better

than most others, (and the child-like simplicity of his character was the reason of it,) that profound knowledge of the human heart was what he could least lay claim to. Southey, however, is to be considered his inferior, because his great poems of 'Madoc,' 'Don Roderick,' and 'Kehama,' 'do not contain the traits which speak at once to all mankind,' but 'are addressed 'to the learned and studious; and these are a mere fragment of 'the human race.' (P. 433.) We are disposed to deny this of the 'Curse of Kehama;' we do utterly deny it of 'Don Roderick.'

Men are frequently tempted to resistance in direct proportion to the peremptoriness of a command; they feel inclined to call the judgment of an arbiter in question, if he assumes to be a universal judge. Something of this tendency is roused in us, as we read page after page of Sir A. Alison's summary assessments of the value of English writers and English literature. One by one, with the same imperturbable air of superiority, they are summoned by him upon the stage, and hurriedly examined, till we think of a pedlar exhibiting his wares, or a Van Amburg propounding the merits of his menageries. And this universality of his decision involves (as might have been looked for) no little inconsistency,—the same reason being assigned as the cause of failure in one man, and of success in another. At one time we are told that it is only through 'contact with men in their business transactions' that 'a thorough knowledge of their secret springs of action can ever be obtained:' at another we are informed, that 'it is not in the arena of politics, or in the busy world of party contention' (*i.e.* by coming in contact with men in their every-day life), 'that the fountains of wisdom are unlocked to mankind.'

If this general criticism of all recent authors be required in order to give a faithful picture of the manners and tone of a particular period, we might with sufficient reason anticipate a failure, no matter who may have undertaken the task. Such an investigation would be protracted through an interminable array of volumes; and a general history cannot spare a thousandth part of the requisite space. The task itself, rashly undertaken, must necessarily be most imperfectly accomplished; —unless indeed there be some principle of selection, some choice of the leading writers in each province of literature, some delineation of each phase of public opinion. But for any such principle, we shall in the present volume look in vain; not only are men, who stand in anything but the foremost ranks of fame, paraded forth with superlative eulogiums,—not only are many, who have influenced the whole tone of thought in the present generation, passed over without notice of any kind;

but in a sketch of British literature professedly *since* the peace, we are treated to a criticism on some who belong to it as little almost as they do to the age of Bacon or of Shakspeare. An attempt is made to show what progress has been made in the study of moral philosophy; but not a single line is devoted to the notice of works written in the kindred province of theology, or to show the momentous influences which have affected religious conviction and practice in the present day. And even in the former,—(from utter want of principle in selection, we presume, or from a most contracted circle of observation, which he has taken no pains to enlarge)—all that the writer deigns to bestow on us is a eulogium on one or two Scotch professors, whose lectures he attended. Without the most distant allusion to either of our great English Universities, without the faintest recognition of any influence which they may have exercised on the present tone of thought—we are left to draw the inference, that Scotland monopolized at this time all that was accurate and patient in investigation, with all that is profound in generalization and induction. We have no wish to underrate the powers of the learned professors of Scotland, nor do we suggest that a history should be filled with an account of long religious controversies; but when a writer undertakes to draw such a picture as that which we conceive Sir A. Alison to have aimed at painting, mere fairness, we think, requires that he should not ignore all the influences which have been chiefly and most prominently at work on the public mind. And surely, in this point of view, the works of what is called the Oxford school of theology are as much to be taken into account as the lectures of Dugald Stewart or Dr. Brown;—at the least, they have more powerfully and deeply left their stamp on a large portion of English society. We might point to many a memorable name, which might deserve to be placed, in a merely intellectual view, not in juxtaposition with, but in indefinite precedence of, that of Dr. Chalmers. But, indeed, it would seem, that the bent of the author's mind does not lead him to dwell long on the higher and more important aspects of things; his intellect is not cast in the mould of Bacon, or of Butler;—there is an eagerness to speak of the pettiest matters of personal appearance and manners, and of his own casual meetings with any of the writers whose merits he is deciding on. The search for truth,—the desire to obtain a more full insight into it,—to get rid of our many crude fancies and misconceptions,—to advance daily in the knowledge of those highest matters which most intimately concern our whole being,—all this seems in his opinion to be of very little consequence. We cannot therefore feel surprised at being told that it is only—

'in statesmen, diplomatic characters, and men of the world, where they are also well-informed, that we must look for the true conversational talent, which consists in the rapid interchange of thoughts on interesting subjects, and which, when it occurs between persons of equal abilities, sympathetic minds, but of opposite sexes, is, perhaps, the greatest enjoyment which life can offer.'

We do not know whether (as his words seem to imply) Sir A. Alison is acquainted with statesmen of opposite sexes; but we marvel to find any writer making use of a word in such a way as to leave the impression, either that he knows not, or cares nothing for the distinction between kind and species, or that he purposely employs a very unworthy equivocation, in order to obtain a support for his own most arbitrary limitations. We will not say, that to give this definition of conversation savours not a little of an empty vanity and conceit; but we must hold it an altogether unjustifiable thing, thus to put into harness, as it were, those powers of oral intercourse which were given to us, to say the least, for other ends, as well as to be the vehicle of the polished refinements of a council, or the courteous pleasantries of a drawing-room. Of those who are gone from their work here, men are for the most part willing enough to speak in terms chiefly of praise or of excuse:—a sterner rule is applied to the living. Sir A. Alison is perhaps desirous of reversing the practice,—a desire which, so far from seeking to thwart, we should wish in every way to be successful. Yet most people will own to a feeling of greater reluctance to utter or to listen to excessive and immoderate praise of men who are still alive, to hear it all themselves;—the feeling is weakened in proportion to the amount of proof brought to bear on the eulogium: it is greatly strengthened, if the praise consist, on the whole, of a string of unsupported assertions. Of this kind certainly are the extravagant encomiums bestowed on Mr. Macaulay, both as an essayist and historian. It would not indeed be true to say, that no touch of shade relieves the blaze of his panegyric; but his qualifications for the latter office (inferior as they are to those which have won such a brilliant reputation for his essays) are made utterly to eclipse all that can be claimed for Arnold or Thirlwall, Grote or Palgrave. It is curious, by the way, to note, that while more than a page is bestowed on Mitford, not a word or allusion occurs to the great work of Thirlwall. Macaulay, it would seem, is fitted to write history in a degree incomparably beyond all these; he has greater knowledge of the way in which the work should be done, and the ends which it should serve. We can but say that we are far from agreeing with him; it is almost tedious to say even this: it is wearisome to be at constant issue with the conclusions of any one, still more to encounter, in page after page of a voluminous work,

fancies and opinions, which belong to the writer, and scarcely to any one else. How strangely must the subject have been studied, when a writer can affirm of all Greek history, that,

'With the exception of the magnificent periods of the Persian invasion, the Syracusan expedition, and Alexander's conquests, it is nothing but the annals of the internal divisions and wars of a cluster of republics, the transactions of which are at once so insignificant and so complicated, that if there is anything more difficult than to make them intelligible, it is to render them interesting to the reader.'—P. 473.

Sir A. Alison's view of history is a little at variance with that of Thucydides: his ideas of the importance and the insignificance of events are confined to mere physical considerations: a war between two states, (whatever be their civilization or their state of society,) each with an army of five thousand men, is a very unimportant matter: the struggle between two armies of a hundred thousand is quite another thing. If, however, the object of the historian be to know what men are at all times and under all conditions, then Thucydides is not uninteresting, although the thread of his history may possibly be somewhat intricate. But we know not with what mind the present author has perused those portions of the narrative of Thucydides which do not relate to the Syracusan expedition, if indeed he has ever read them at all, an alternative which suggests itself as possible from the peculiarities attributed to various writers in whom general opinion has discovered qualities entirely different. We are drawn on to question his acquaintance with Thucydides or with Arrian, when we find him speaking of Hallam—a writer (whatever the soundness of his conclusions) unimpassioned almost to frigidity—as being one whose 'mind is more imaginative than those of his laborious predecessors,' and in whom 'a fervent eloquence, a poetic expression, often 'reveals the ardour which the heart-stirring events of his time 'had communicated to his disposition.' (P. 463.) Either he cannot have read Hallam, or his ideas of poetry and ardour must be even more strange than we had taken them to be.

In this singular chapter, however, little is left us but to select some few strange criticisms, where almost all are strange and curious. We feel lost in a sea of common places, in which he seems to float with all the facility of a sea-bird in its native element,—common places so trite, and forms of expression of great sound but with so little meaning, that we refuse to receive him as a judge in anything. If the learned New Zealander of a future day, standing on the ruins of Westminster bridge, will imbibe strange ideas of the former greatness of fallen London, he will arrive at opinions no less strange of English literature at the present time, if this chapter be the only clue left to him in the study of it. For independent judg-

ment we look in vain,—the old forms hang like a mill-stone round his neck. If Southey is great in poetry, he must be compared to Virgil; if Campbell be magnificent in lyrics, he must be placed behind Horace; if Grote is to be spoken of as a historian, he must be weighed in the balance with Tacitus. There is something too much of this when we are told that Arnold's 'account of the campaigns of Hannibal, the best that 'exists in any language, proves that, like Livy, he was adequate 'to the history of the majestic series of Roman victories;'—something too much of verbosity, when we are informed that he 'had great graphic powers, a strong turn alike for geo-'graphical description, strategical operations, and tactical evolu-'tions;'—a somewhat superfluous minuteness, (even if the judgment be not altogether questionable,) when we read that 'a critical taste will probably condemn the strange style in 'which he has narrated the early and immortal legends of 'Rome, and regret that the charming simplicity of Livy was 'not imitated in translating his pages;'—something too much of grandiloquent affectation of superiority, when he graciously allows that 'a generous mind will hesitate to condemn where there is so much to admire.' We may think the criticism as little to the point, as we may wonder at the principle on which (one to each) successive paragraphs are devoted to Sir Bulwer Lytton, D'Israeli, Dickens, Thackeray, Miss Austin, Mrs. Norton, Warren, Carlyle, Dr. Croly, Hazlitt, Bentham, Chalmers, Monckton Milnes, and Aytown, L. E. L., Eliot Warburton, and the author of 'Eothen.'

One subject yet remains—that of Art,—Sir A. Alison's treatment of which will leave on those, who have really studied it with serious honest thought, an impression of mere astonishment at the startling boldness with which he has acted on the principle, that to be a judge in any matter it is quite unnecessary to know anything about it. So much of redundant verbiage, such an assemblage of hackneyed opinions, such a strain of feeble thought, is not very often presented to the reading public. The quantity of space devoted to each is—to architecture one page, to painting five, to sculpture two and a half, to the drama more than five. We have no intention of writing a treatise on each of these arts, although such certainly would be required for a refutation of Sir A. Alison's lucubrations; and, moreover, a fear of lost labour would restrain us, (if we felt competent for so Herculean a task,) for he has probably 'done thinking' long ago, and it would perhaps be useless to attempt the uprooting of stereotyped truisms and long-cherished fallacies.

The histrionic art, we are told, is 'the efflorescence of sculpture,' as the drama is 'the efflorescence of epic poetry.' With

this solitary observation he passes on to personal descriptions of first and second-rate actors, in which 'the commanding figure, raven locks, and sonorous voice of Mrs. Siddons,' 'the raven hue' of John Kemble's hair, 'the finely-chiselled Grecian countenance, dark glossy hair, the skin smooth as monumental marble,' of Miss O'Neil, are carefully specified; while the 'dark raven locks, fine figure, and expressive countenance,' of Miss Helen Faucit are not forgotten.

But the palmy days are over, and Siddons and Kemble are no more seen in their majestic dignity; and if they were, their surpassing excellence might be thrown away on a sensuous overstimulated age. This decay of the 'histrionic art' elicits the lamentations of the writer; and the words which convey them are again a curious specimen of unfair and inconclusive reasoning. This deterioration is caused by 'the gradual rise and 'ultimate ascendency of a middle class in society, the minds in 'which are not so cultivated as to enable them to enjoy intel-'lectual or moral pleasures, while their senses are sufficiently 'excited to render them fully alive to the enjoyments of the 'physical.' On this point each man may think as he pleases, although it may perhaps be noted, that the most rapturous applause even from the most degraded audience is invariably elicited by the delineation of high and noble feeling, and the unselfish daring of self-sacrifice and devotion.

'The change,' moreover, 'was accelerated, and perhaps prematurely brought on in this country, by the well-meant and sincere, but unfortunate, prejudices of a large and respectable portion of society, which withdrew altogether from our theatres, from a natural feeling of indignation at the immorality of some of its dramas, and the licence of many of its accessories. There can be no doubt it would be well if these abuses could be corrected; and it would also be well if corruption could be banished from literature, vice from the world. Unfortunately, the one is not more likely to happen than the other . . . and the unhappy result of the respectable classes withdrawing from the theatre has been too often to convert what might be at least occasionally the school of virtue into the academy of vice.'—P. 507.

Such an argument as this would not be utterly worthless, if the parallel between dramatic representations and general literature were such as he represents it to be. The chief way in which the latter is brought before us, is by the books which a man keeps in his house or in his library: and any one may possess ten thousand volumes without including a single work which should outrage decency, or be at war with all right moral feeling. Undoubtedly the presence of the respectable classes at the theatre may have some control over the selection of pieces to be performed,—it is a known fact that it had little or none over the 'licence of the accessories.' We may pass into and leave our libraries without encountering scenes of the grossest

temptation and most degrading coarseness at its threshold. No one, in seeking to derive wisdom from the thoughts of Pascal or the arguments of Butler, is required to drink in, before or after it, the gross unseemliness of Wicherley or Congreve.

It may be a grave question, or perhaps to many a matter not worth questioning, whether any man was ever really qualified for the office of a universal critic. 'Non omnia possumus omnes,' is a maxim which may possibly be taken as conclusive on this subject. To each science, to every branch of learning, in every department of art there is its own, peculiar labour; no royal road will open up an easier access to excellence in any one of them. In most of them, it is generally agreed, we must be tolerably well versed before we may presume to give any judgment at all. The keenest sagacity in discovering the merits or demerits of cattle, will not entitle a man to pronounce an opinion on the growth of cotton; the greatest experience in the application of machinery, as a substitute for manual labour, will not qualify a man to decide on a point of logic or metaphysics. Sir A. Alison appears, indeed, to have a profound disregard of all such conventional limitations of the critic's authority: with regard to many of them, we might be willing to leave him to the judgment of the world, which will readily deprive him of the judicial garb wherewith he has been pleased to array himself. There is but one subject on which, unfortunately, a conventional licence suffers any one to give a dictatorial judgment; and that subject is one in which, perhaps more than all others, both study and experience are needed to qualify a man to give any opinion. It is quite true that the subject-matter of art in general is that which is presented to the senses, and that all alike are possessed of these senses; but there are, perhaps, no differences so great between man and man as the various amount of power, which from education, each sense possesses. The eye will not see, the ear will not hear, that which it has not been trained to see and hear: one man will look on the unmoved surface of some sleeping waters, and see nothing but a flat, smooth surface undisturbed by wind; another will therein discover a new world, a fairer image of the actual world of material earth on which he treads—will watch each trembling shadow as it leads him gently down to the clear depths of a most serene and peaceful home of quietness and repose—will dwell on each changeful hue which speaks to him of a splendour borrowed, while increased in brilliancy, from the fair flowers which clothe the margin of the slumbering lake. One man will hear in the most celestial strains of music nothing but mere sound; another will by the same be led on from earth to heaven, and to deem that the sounds which entrance his

material ear are echoes from a home which belongs to him in a better world—will catch the hidden and wondrous harmonies which impress their own unmistakable character on the volume of song which falls as mere physical reverberation on the ear of him who has in his soul no music. The world takes no cognizance of these distinctions, while it calls them frequently too subtle and fanciful; it rests, for the most part, merely on the fact that each man has an eye and ear, and concludes that each man is therefore a competent judge of everything which addresses itself to either, whether his opinion be based on long and careful study and experience, or whether it be the mere enunciation of a conclusion at which he has arrived without a moment's thoughtfulness. To this conclusion Sir A. Alison, in practice, most eagerly assents; this licence of judging on unstudied subjects he most fully claims. Our unaided reason would perhaps lead us to think that a man had acquainted himself, however slightly, with that which he undertakes to criticise; and so we might feel a delicacy in insinuating an opposite conclusion with regard to any writer. But in the present instance there is no option left us;—it would be marvellous, indeed, if any possessed a full and thorough acquaintance with every subject touched on in this chapter of which we are speaking. It is ten times more difficult to suppose that Sir A. Alison possesses this multifarious knowledge, when the result of his labours is so astonishingly strange: yet more, a man may disagree with another on many points of intellectual or moral research; he may think one man has attained in these respects to a higher standard than another; but he is not excusable if he attributes excellence to one who is entirely destitute of any claims to a reputation for it.

Still more is this the case in an age in which so much of time, and labour, and energy has been devoted to the promotion of art in every shape. Art has become an object of study—of the most serious, patient study—the object of a life's research to many whose powers would qualify them to attain eminence in almost any branch of human learning. Nor has the result produced by these efforts been small. We have had many books written—many works of art accomplished—of which we may well be proud, surrounded at the same time by still more numerous examples of labour wasted and energy misapplied. It becomes, therefore, matter of grave moment that both should be rated at their exact value, and that none should have accorded to them a praise which they do not deserve; and yet we say boldly, that in no other part of his book has Sir A. Alison so striven to throw dust in our eyes, so to invest mere verbose inanity with an air of philosophical grandeur, as in the paragraphs which he

has (we will not say, devoted, but) expended on the examination of the arts of architecture, painting, and sculpture. The author knew perfectly well, that he was writing wholly and solely 'ad captandum vulgus,' and the most unthinking portion of it, when he penned the following lines on the architectural improvements of London after the peace of 1815:—

'Regent-street, opened up through one of the densest parts of London, soon exhibited a splendid and varied scene of architectural decoration and mercantile opulence; Regent's Park showed long lines of pillared scenery surmounting its glassy lake and umbrageous foliage; and Waterloo, Southwark, and London Bridges bestrode the floods of the Thames with arches second to none in magnificence and durability.'

The Commissioners may have formed a somewhat different opinion on this last statement. But of the really great works of restoration of ecclesiastical buildings—and of churches newly designed since that period,—in short, of the whole revival of art in our days,—not a single word is spoken; and, so far as the present volume is concerned, we should be far from dreaming that we had lived in the days of Scott and of Pugin.

If superficial knowledge be all that is needed to constitute a critic, certainly Sir A. Alison may claim the title; in many cases, he can lay claim to no other. Still, whatever advantages there may be, according to Mr. Macaulay, in this kind of learning, it may be doubted whether any one will, in this day, be suffered to issue imperious decrees of judgment on points wherein he is possessed of no experience. Such merely arbitrary criticisms might almost be dismissed without notice, were it not that many are likely to be led astray by the bare assumption of superiority; and the author, imperious and dictatorial elsewhere, speaks in a tone still more dogmatical of topics on which public taste is, perhaps, least cultivated, and where a certain kind of conventional criticism is most likely to produce erroneous convictions. After all, however, that has been written on the subject of art, more especially on the art of painting, it is astonishing to find any writer giving publicity to such miserably feeble and vapid reasoning (if, indeed, it deserves the name) as the following:—

'Turner,' he says, 'in landscape-painting has attained a reputation more likely to be durable' than Sir T. Lawrence in portraits; 'for in genius he is equal, in variety of conception superior, to Claude himself. No one can study the "Liber Studiorum" of the former master, with the "Liber Veritatis" of the latter, without perceiving that the palm of originality and variety of imagination must be awarded to the first. There is none of his pictures as perfect as one of Claude; none over which the glow of an Italian sunset is thrown with such magic over every object in the piece—the sky, the sea, the trees. But there is greater variety in his effects; his drawing from nature has extended over a much wider surface; his fancy is more discursive, his conceptions wilder and more dissimilar. He has aimed at and

succeeded in awakening emotions of a far more varied kind than his predecessor. Within his own limits, Claude is perfection; but those limits are narrow. Turner's embrace the whole earth and all ages of history. It is to the power of his conceptions, however, and the vigour of his imagination, that this unqualified praise applies. In delicacy of finishing, harmony of colouring, and minuteness of detail, combined with generality of effect, he is inferior to Claude; as, indeed, every subsequent painter has been, and perhaps ever will be.'—P. 495.

A passage which should equally deserve to draw upon the author all the contempt which Horace lavishes on his countrymen for a slavish worship of the old, merely as being old, could scarcely be produced throughout the wide range of English literature. They who can give a moment's hearing to such words as these, do indeed fill themselves with the east wind. It is only because so many—because the ordinary run of men—are so ready to be deceived by such high sounding emptiness, that they can be considered to deserve mention at all. In order to account for his strange estimate of Hallam, we were driven to suppose he had not read his writings: we cannot draw, in this instance, a similar conclusion, and say that he has not seen Turner's or Claude's pictures. Unfortunately, it is easier to form a wrong judgment on these, even after having seen them an indefinite number of times, than to be wide of the mark in speaking of a book which one has never perused. We have had—we still have—very great men amongst our landscape painters,—men whose works are in greater or less degree reproductions of the wonderful thoughts of God impressed on the natural world. There is, moreover, a far keener and higher appreciation of these works, and of nature herself, than ever there has been before: but it is difficult to conceive a more utter blindness than that which prevails on this subject with, perhaps, nine-tenths of those who consider themselves—and perhaps are—well qualified to judge on many other points, whatever may be their deficiencies in this. We have ourselves passed with many from a survey, not only of Turner's pictures, but those of other painters, to the ancient 'master-pieces' of Claude, Salvator, and Poussin. Without any paltry desire to underrate the latter, because men frequently assign to them an absurdly extravagant value, it would be far nearer the truth to characterise the change as a transition from daylight to the regions of utter darkness,—from the rich exuberance of life to the dull monotony of one, or, at the utmost, three or four hackneyed ideas, or the exaggerated expression of a few truths at the expense of the utter sacrifice of countless others; and yet we have known educated people look on the faithful portraitures of recent artists with a patronising air of infinite superiority, and bow down in abject, unquestioning homage before the works,

good or bad, which the painters of a so-called classical age have left to us. Argument in such a case is thrown away; it is as unnecessary as, for the purpose of producing conviction, we fear, it would be useless.

An absolute and entire denial is the best method of meeting such assertions. Claude's limits are, as Sir A. Alison rightly says, very narrow indeed. It is false to assert that he is anything like perfection, in the narrow cage wherein he has chosen to coop himself. With regard to Turner's power of execution, it must first be stated whether we refer to his oil paintings, or his water-colour drawings; but, in any case, it is a matter of indifference whether the surface of a picture in oils be as smooth 'as the alabaster skin' of Sir A. Alison's actress. The question is, whether the painter has succeeded in conveying some true and beautiful lesson which he has learnt from the works of God,—whether he has conveyed it in all its fulness, with an equal regard to every truth in all its infinite variety; not whether he has embodied some one portion of its teaching, to the utter loss of every other. To assert that Claude does thus convey the truth of nature's lessons, in faithful translations of its breadth, and its endless variety of detail, is obviously false. If a man will profess to discover, in the canvas of Claude, the poor home of at best one or two ideas,—we will not say, the rich and exuberant truth of Turner, but the indefinitely greater faithfulness of even our average recent painters,—if he will delude himself into the thought, that the pitchy blackness of Nicolo Poussin is radiant with the light of Roberts, or of Stanfield,—if he will assert, that Salvator and Rubens are more varied in their effects, more beautiful in their colouring, than Landseer or Copley Fielding, —nothing more can be done than to leave such an one to his own devices, like the mole to its earth, and the bat to its darkness. The wonderful and ever-varying beauty of nature is spread out before him in vain: these deep thoughts of God he has no soul to understand. The unwise man cannot well consider them, nor can he discern who is a faithful student of nature's touching loveliness, or the copyist of some one of its prominent characteristics, which he stereotypes for almost every picture.

But we may leave the National Gallery to answer any question respecting Claude's perfection, and Turner's inferiority,—only remarking that it is unfortunate that Sir A. Alison seems to have a peculiar knack of saying of a particular book or thing, the very reverse of what would be said by others. Mr. Ruskin, in one most important branch of art, has done very great and good service; nor do we think that, in respect of landscape painting, his 'ingenuity has been exerted in an inde-

fensible cause;' but we are as far from thinking that his 'Seven Lamps of Architecture' is 'one of the most profound and original books of the kind in the language.' It would be mere absurdity to assert this of a work, in which architecture is defined to be the introduction of unnecessary and useless ornaments on the necessary form of a building. There is little extravagance in his work on 'Modern Painters:' in the others there is much more. To Sir A. Alison's vision, the tree seems to be less fruitful in proportion to its luxuriance.

But the reader may be wearied with a longer catalogue of fallacies, as much as the critic may be bewildered in his effort to select from such an exuberant harvest some which stand out more glaringly than others. If our judgment appear harsh, it is because an affectation of universal knowledge, and a self-opinionated dogmatism, are not to be suffered to establish an undisputed supremacy; and it is our deliberate conviction, after a most careful and patient examination of the volume, and especially of this chapter on Art and Literature, that a more extraordinary farrago of trite common places, of reflections obvious to a school-boy, of antiquated and obsolete maxims, has rarely been presented to the English public. Such an attempt to lord it over the whole realm of knowledge is as sure to be unsuccessful as it is to be resisted. Sir A. Alison may think himself monarch of all he surveys, but he will find no lack of antagonists to dispute his right. We have but endeavoured to root up a few of the weeds which have appeared to us to multiply the longer we have looked on them. To describe fully their wonderful fertility we frankly confess to be altogether beyond our powers. We have not spoken of the learning, which mentions Socrates as a writer along with Sophocles and Thucydides. Not being aware of the discovery of MSS., which boast of the husband of Xantippe as their author, we are reluctant to suppose that Sir A. Alison has confounded him with the ecclesiastical historian of another era: we have not paused to note his comparison of Sir Bulwer Lytton to a horse, when he attributes to him chivalrous feelings which 'never perhaps exist 'in such purity as in those, who, like the Arab steed of high 'descent, can trace their pedigree back through a long series of 'ancestors:' we have not admired the discrimination which perceives in Miss Strickland excellences similar to those of Macaulay: we have not dwelt on the taste which speaks with such relish of entertainments, whereat Lady Holland and Sir James Mackintosh, Macaulay and Landseer, Jeffrey and Chantrey, were to be met at dinner, 'where Moore sang his 'bewitching melodies with still more bewitching right honour-'ables in the evening.'

History, indeed, has a work to perform, the sacredness of which none can describe in terms too forcible: the present work might almost make us blush that any writer of the present day could entertain so poor a notion of its dignity. Sir A. Alison's second volume has just been given to the world: it cannot be expected to refute all the fallacies, and remove the erroneous impressions of the first; we can only hope that it may not contribute to multiply and heighten them. Some lessons certainly there are which he may learn from Arnold and Macaulay: some possibly from what may be to him the unknown labours of Thirlwall and of Merivale.

ART. VI.—1. *Theological Essays.* *By* FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE, M.A. *Chaplain of Lincoln's Inn, and Professor of Divinity in King's College, London.* Cambridge: Macmillan. 1853.

2. *Grounds for laying before the Council of King's College, London, certain Statements contained in a recent Publication, entitled 'Theological Essays, by the Rev. F. D. Maurice, M.A. Professor of Divinity in King's College.'* *By* R. W. JELF, D.D. *Principal of King's College, and Canon of Christ Church.* Oxford and London: Parker and Rivingtons. 1853.

3. *The Word 'Eternal,' and the Punishment of the Wicked. A Letter to the Rev. Dr. Jelf, Canon of Christ Church, and Principal of King's College.* *By* FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE, *Chaplain of Lincoln's Inn.* Cambridge: Macmillan.

THE publication of these Essays has, as our readers are well aware, led to the removal of Mr. Maurice from King's College. His removal, whatever reasons have compelled it, is the loss to that institution of a man of great ability, energy, zeal, and disinterestedness, who has lived above worldly motives, and devoted himself to public interests, religious, moral, and social; and who, as a theological professor, has imparted life and interest to a subject too often abandoned to technicality, and made dry and distasteful to students by its mode of treatment. We cannot, however, after reading these Essays, own to much surprise at such a result, however we may regret it, or consider Mr. Maurice a safe guide to theological students. He will himself readily allow, that there are other qualifications which a divinity professor ought to have, besides high personal character, or animation as a lecturer and writer, though he will differ from us, and from the authorities of King's College, as to what those qualifications are. We will at once say,—with whatever sorrow we have arrived at such a judgment,—that the opinions advanced in these Essays unfit him for the position of a theological teacher in any Church of England college.

But we will defer these critical points for the present. We had rather meet Mr. Maurice, to begin with, on more general subject matter, such as can be discussed and commented on, without any charge affecting orthodoxy being involved. The Essays are highly discursive, and embrace much material belonging to ordinary philosophy and thought. And though a

taste for philosophy does not necessarily make a philosopher, Mr. Maurice's taste for this department is such as to give an interest to his reflections and speculations in it, and to claim a respectful examination of them,—a task which is attended, indeed, often with considerable difficulties, in the case of a writer whose strength is that of vehemence rather than accuracy, and who thinks less like a reasoner than a rhetorician; who employs, to prove his conclusions, rather a determination of the will than the ordinary instrument of argument, and is too generally almost as obscure as he is emphatic; but a task, at the same time, which will not be without its reward, as bringing us into contact with a mind of considerable gifts and resources. It is fortunate for the world, in the long run, that all the men who come forward to instruct and enlighten it are not cast in the same mould, and that some, according to their natural bent, reason, and others prophesy. There is a depth of mind which explains itself, and unfolds its ideas in regular order; and there is also a depth which asserts itself, which throws out its contents, to produce their impression and make their way as such. The former is the more perfect method humanly; the latter is more divine. It is a kind of inspiration, and has an authoritativeness from the absence of art. Indeed, in proportion as minds are full of an idea or ideas, it is difficult for them to arrange or methodise them, or put them in the order of proof as addressed to other intelligences. Luther is little better than a chaos; Jansen the same. Even S. Augustine disguises much involved repetition of himself, under the charms of an antithetical and highly worked style. The reason is, these men were exceedingly full of the ideas to which they respectively devoted themselves. The consequence was, that they could not afford to adopt that stationary attitude of mind toward them, which was necessary to see them in their argumentative place. It may be pretty safely said, that no one can see clearly except he stands still. But the act of standing still is exceedingly distasteful to minds under the impulse of particular ideas. To go forward is their natural bent; the instant they feel themselves stopping, they are as uneasy as passengers in a quick train. Quiescence, however short or provisional, is to them stagnation, torpor, and death. They feel a total cessation of their inner life, the instant the active office of putting forth and expressing stops: they are tormented by a sense of barrenness and shame, as if they were idle and vain portions of the universe. They consequently never get one fair look at the idea which is impelling them, so as to examine it, and see on what it rests. To minds cast in a critical mould, on the other hand, the attitude of rest and examination is comparatively easy. Mr. Maurice will, we are sure,

not take it amiss if we put him into the order of prophets, and assign strength of conviction rather than of argument as his fort.

We will begin with Mr. Maurice's philosophy respecting conscience, and his reflections on the defects and uncertainty of Bishop Butler's doctrine on that subject. 'As Butler is com-'monly interpreted,' he says, 'he assumes all moral principles 'to depend entirely on probable evidence.' He regards Butler as entertaining 'strong *presumptions* in favour of a moral consti tution of man,' but, apparently, no more than presumptions. We wish Mr. Maurice had stated positively what he considered Bishop Butler's grounds to have been, and not put his assertion respecting those grounds into the ambiguous form of an assertion respecting them 'as commonly interpreted.' But as he considers this to be the common interpretation of Butler, and nowhere endeavours to prove that this interpretation is a wrong one, but proceeds to argue at length on the supposition of its truth, we shall suppose Mr. Maurice to state that Bishop Butler 'assumes all moral principles to depend entirely on probable evidence,' and to assert that his scheme only puts forth 'strong presumptions in favour of a moral constitution of man.' And when Mr. Maurice proceeds, as he does, to lament the scepticism of such a scheme, and to treat it as erecting the whole moral law upon a basis of uncertainty, we understand him to describe consequences which, in his opinion, flow from the natural interpretation of Bishop Butler's doctrine respecting conscience.

Now, of such a charge against Bishop Butler we can only say, that we cannot easily understand how anyone can make it, who has read Butler's statements on the subject of conscience and human nature with ordinary attention. Probability has been defined by Butler himself—and his definition is one which nobody can object to—to consist principally in *likeness*. Where we have no actual *perception* of any thing or event, we may still argue the truth of it from the fact of its likeness to other things or events which we have perceived. Probability, therefore, does not apply in the case of things of which we have actual perception: these are not probable, but certain. And though there may be cases in which we do not know for certain whether we perceive or not, and in which, therefore, probability comes in, still so far as we perceive, so far we are certain about a thing. Now, Butler places moral obligations upon certain plain and immediate perceptions inherent in our nature—perceptions which distinguish some actions from others, and attach to them the respective epithets of good and bad. It is almost frivolous to prove by extracts, what runs through the whole of the Sermons on Human Nature, and either appears in, or is supported by, every statement which Bishop Butler makes respecting morals,

from one end of his works to the other. 'There is a principle,' he says, 'of reflection in men, by which they distinguish between, 'approve and disapprove their own actions. We are plainly 'constituted such sort of creatures as to reflect upon our own 'nature. The mind can take a view of what passes within 'itself, its propensions, aversions, passions, affections, as respecting such objects and such degrees, and of the several actions 'consequent thereupon. In this survey, it approves of one, disapproves of another, and towards a third is affected in neither 'of these ways, but is quite indifferent. This principle in man, 'by which he disapproves his heart, temper, and actions, is 'conscience.' Here is a certain act of the mind described, which is plainly that of perception; to approve or disapprove being evidently to *see* a certain character good or bad in the actions which come under our view. And just as the act of conscience is an act of perception, so the authority which attaches to this act is an object also of perception. And supposing a man to allow the fact of a conscience, but deny its authority, Butler tells him in reply, that the *authority* of conscience is perceived. 'The principle of reflection or conscience being compared with the various appetites, passions, and affections in men, 'the former is *manifestly* superior and chief, without regard to 'strength.' It 'manifestly' is superior and chief, *i. e.* it is *seen* quite plainly to be so. The appeal which Butler makes throughout is to certain immediate and clear perceptions in our nature; and it might as well be asserted that the evidence of our bodily senses rested upon presumption, as that moral obligations did upon Butler's system.

But it may be said that though Butler places morality upon the basis of natural perception, he places religion upon a basis of presumption simply; and that for the grounds for believing in a Divine moral government of the Universe, and a final state of reward and punishment, he refers us to analogy;—to the circumstance, that is, that we see a moral government in this world, and therefore that we may expect it in another. Now it is quite true that Butler does not—and it would be absurd if he did—represent the evidence of religion as being that of immediate perception, but neither does he represent it as being merely presumption. There is a mode of proof which is neither immediate perception nor presumption, which is commonly called reasoning; that act of the mind by which we see a certain conclusion follow from certain premises before us, without being actually in or part of those premises. There are, it is true, different kinds of this sort of proof—different kinds of reasoning. There is demonstrative, or mathematical; and there is a less urgent kind, such as the argument from final causes:

but both kinds are in strength far above the argument of mere presumption or analogy; and Butler moreover proved the truth of religion by both these modes of reasoning.

First, he held the existence of a God to be proved demonstratively, in the same way in which mathematical conclusions are deduced from their premises. And there later philosophy does not appear to go along with him. But this mode of proof was part of the religious philosophy of the age in which he lived, and which he seems to have adopted out of respect to high names, and—we may almost say—contrary to his own better judgment. Locke and Clarke proved the existence of a God by demonstrative reasoning; they argued from the principle, that all things that begin to exist must have a cause, and by a keen and subtle use of this argument, professed to reduce the atheist to the position of a man who denied that two and two were four, or that things that were equal to the same were equal to one another. Locke begins his chapter on the proof of a Deity with these words,—'We are capable of knowing *certainly* that there is a God:' and by certainty he proceeds to say that he means 'a certainty equal to mathematical certainty;' adding indeed—'if I mistake not'—a rather ominous commencement of such a proof, but of which the spirit does not appear to last or to operate as a hindrance on him. His reflection upon his argument, after the explanation of it, is—'From 'what has been said, it is plain to me that we have a more 'certain knowledge of the existence of a God, than of anything 'our senses have not immediately discovered to us. Nay, I 'presume I may say that we may more certainly know that 'there is a God, than there is anything else without us.' 'It 'is as certain,' he says elsewhere, 'that there is a God, as that the 'opposite angles, made by the intersection of two straight lines, 'are equal.' Clarke expanded the fundamental axiom on which all this reasoning went, and said not only, 'everything that *begins* to exist must have a cause,' but 'everything that *exists* has a cause,'—a startling proposition, but which he makes orthodox by means of a larger sense which he annexes to the word cause. 'Whatever exists has a cause, a ground of its 'existence, a foundation on which its existence relies; a ground 'or reason why it doth exist, rather than not exist; either in 'the necessity of its own nature, or in the will of some other 'being.' The former of these two grounds or reasons he then applied to the case of the Supreme Being, and laid down a necessity for the existence of a God, as contained in the existence of Time and Space, which, as being not substances themselves, but modes and attributes of substance, implied a substance which supported them; and, inasmuch as they were

infinite, an infinite and eternal substance. This necessity for the existence of a God, he calls 'a necessity absolutely such in its own nature,' *i. e.* nothing else but 'its being a plain impossibility, or implying a contradiction to suppose the contrary,' —a necessity of which 'the relation of equality between twice 'two and four is an instance; it being an immediate contra-'diction in terms to suppose these two unequal.' And upon this proof of the existence of a God, he bases this reflection: 'From hence it follows that there is no man whatsoever, who 'makes any use of his reason, but may easily become more 'certain of the being of a Supreme Independent Cause, than he 'can be of anything else besides his own existence. For how 'much thought soever it may require to demonstrate the other 'attributes of such a Being, as it may do to demonstrate the 'greatest mathematical certainties; yet as to its existence, that 'there is somewhat eternal, infinite, and self-existing, which 'must be the cause and original of all other things; this is one 'of the first and most natural conclusions that any man can 'frame in his mind: and no man can any more doubt of this, 'than he can doubt whether twice two be equal to four. 'Tis 'possible, indeed, that a man may in some sense be ignorant of 'this first and plain truth, by being utterly stupid, and not 'thinking at all. But this I say, there is no man who thinks 'or reasons at all, but may easily become more certain that 'there is something eternal, infinite, and self-existing, than he 'can be certain of anything else.'

It may appear indeed somewhat strange that it did not occur to a philosopher that he was getting out of his depth when he argued that the existence of the Deity was necessary as the substratum of time and space; and the correspondence between Butler and Clarke, given in the common editions of Butler's works, shows that that suspicion was entertained by Butler, though then a youthful thinker, and expressed as became a young man writing to the great metaphysician of the day, with the utmost modesty and caution. 'I cannot say that I believe 'your argument not conclusive; for I must own my ignorance, 'that I am really at a loss about the nature of space and dura-'tion. But did it plainly appear that they were properties of a 'substance, we should have an easy way with the atheists; for 'it would at once demonstrably prove an eternal, necessary, and 'self-existent Being; that there is but one such; and that He 'is needful in order to the existence of all other things;—which 'makes me think that though it may be true, yet it is not 'obvious to every capacity; otherwise it would have been 'generally used as a fundamental argument to prove the being 'of a God.'

Now this metaphysical ground for the existence and attributes of God has its weaknesses, but one weakness certainly cannot be laid to its charge, viz. that of being too diffident, and too doubtful. It professed to be a demonstration, a mathematical proof of the existence of a God. And so far as Butler acknowledged this ground,—and he always does appeal to 'abstract reasonings,' as proof of religion,—so far, certainly, he cannot be said to have based the evidence of religion on mere probabilities and presumptions.

But such arguments as these could not prove the moral government of God. To prove this, philosophy has used the second sort of reasoning. It has argued from the moral nature of the creature to the moral character of the Creator; and from the moral character of God to His moral government. This common recognised argument of religious philosophy is always supposed and its validity taken for granted by Butler. He regards conscience as the 'voice of God within us,' and its approbation and disapprobation as anticipations of a future and final Divine judgment. This is not demonstration; but neither is it an appeal to mere chances and presumptions.

To Mr. Maurice's charge then—that Butler 'assumes all moral principles to depend on probable evidence,' our answer is plain. If by 'moral principles' are meant moral obligations, moral principles are maintained by Butler to be the objects of clear mental intuition: if by 'moral principles' are meant the Divine moral government, moral principles we then allow are made by Butler to depend on probable evidence; but only on probable evidence as distinguished from demonstration, not as being mere guess and presumption; on sound, valid and irresistible probable *reasoning*.

But it will be said, that the arguments which Butler has *put forward* are at any rate arguments of analogy or presumption; and that he has written a book called the 'Analogy,' which is entirely devoted to them. He has; and nothing can show more clearly that which we assert of Butler—that he did not rest the evidence of religion on analogy—than the ground which he assigns to analogy in this book. He tells us expressly, that he adopts analogy as an appeal to men who will not acknowledge any other ground. He says in the advertisement, 'It is come, 'I know not how, to be taken for granted by many persons, 'that Christianity is now not so much as a subject of inquiry; 'but that it is now at length discovered to be fictitious. And 'accordingly they treat it as if in the present age this were an 'agreed point among all people of discernment; and nothing 'remained but to set it up as a principal subject of mirth 'and ridicule, as it were by way of reprisals for having so long

'interrupted the pleasures of the world. On the contrary, thus 'much at least will be here found, not taken for granted, but 'proved, that any reasonable man who will thoroughly consider 'the matter, may be as much assured as he is of his own being, 'that it is not however so clear a case, that there is nothing in 'it. There is, I think, strong evidence of its truth; but it is 'certain no one can upon principles of reason be satisfied of the 'contrary.' He is arguing then with men who do not acknowledge the ordinary evidences for Christianity. And it is the same with respect to natural religion. He is arguing with men who do not admit the ordinary evidence for natural religion, and the Divine moral government. Having excluded themselves then from the strong ground of evidence, he offers, or rather fastens upon them, another much weaker, but still better than none at all. 'There is, I think, strong evidence of the truth' of religion; but that evidence he does not now bring forward, because it consists of an appeal to our moral nature, which can be strong evidence only to those who admit that moral nature. He is obliged to confine himself to a kind of evidence which leads to a much weaker result, and does not prove that religion is true, but only that it cannot be set down as false—'that they cannot be satisfied to the contrary.' But as that is the only kind of evidence they acknowledge, he uses it. It is evidently a gain if even such a result can be produced. Evidence which leads even to an inferior conclusion, is valuable if it is of a species which is admitted and recognised by the persons addressed, while to address evidence to them which led to the most positive conclusion, would be wholly useless, if the evidence itself was of a species which they did not recognise. The argument, then, on which Butler *himself* considered the truth of religion to rest, was a different one from the argument used in the Analogy. Does not Mr. Maurice himself admit this?

'He did, however, use words addressed to the loose thinkers of his day, the men of wit and fashion about town, which seem to confound "probabilities," with "chances;" to suggest the thought that we are to calculate the likelihood of religious principles being true, and that if there is even a slight balance in favour of them—nay, none at all—we are to throw in the danger of rejecting them as a makeweight, and so to force ourselves into the adoption of them. I groan over these words as I read them, feeling how much a great and good man was sacrificing of what was dearest to his heart, for the sake of an *argumentum ad hominem*, which, after all, was not an argument that ever reached the conscience of any man, or that could do so, if the conscience is what Butler affirms it to be.'—*Maurice's Theological Essays*, p. 234.

Why does Mr. Maurice groan? We see no reason for it, even according to his own statement. He calls Butler's argument an *argumentum ad hominem*. But is not an argumentum ad

hominem, by the very force of the expression, an argument which a man uses out of accommodation to another, and not the argument upon which he rests himself the truth of the conclusion in which he believes? Does a man give up his own stronger ground, because he uses another weaker one, out of accommodation to another man, who will not listen to the stronger? And if he does not, what is there to deplore? Truth is not injured, and a charity is done.

Not that the Analogy, though addressed primarily, is addressed solely to those who do not admit the stronger ground of evidence for religion. Undoubtedly, however we may admit that stronger ground, analogy is a confirmation of it; and that testimony of conscience to the moral and immoral character of actions, on which we substantially base our anticipation of a future judgment, is strengthened when we see that as a matter of fact these actions are, to a large extent, respectively rewarded and punished in this life. But this again does not make analogy the *ground* of our belief in religion. On the contrary, it makes it pre-suppose that ground. Nor can anything be more distinct and express than Butler's own statement on this subject. '*It is* '*not the purpose*,' he says, '*of this treatise properly to prove God's* '*perfect moral government over the world;* but to observe what 'there is in the constitution and course of nature to confirm the 'proper proof supposed to be known. Pleasure and pain are 'indeed, to a certain degree, say to a very high degree, distri-'buted amongst us without any regard to the merit and demerit 'of characters. And were there nothing also concerning this 'matter discernible in the constitution and course of nature, 'there would be no ground from the constitution and course of 'nature to hope or to fear that men would be rewarded or 'punished hereafter according to their deserts. *And thus the* '*proof of a future state of retribution would rest upon the usual* '*known arguments for it, which I think are plainly unanswerable,* '*and would be so were there no additional confirmation of them* '*from the things above insisted on.*'[1] Again, 'That there is an intel-'ligent Author of Nature, a natural governor of the world, is a 'principle gone upon in the foregoing treatise as proved, and 'generally known and confessed to be proved. And the very 'notion of an intelligent Author of Nature, proved by particular 'final causes, implies a will and a character. *Now as our whole* '*nature, the nature which He has given us, leads us to conclude his* '*will and character to be moral, just, and good, so we can scarce in* '*imagination conceive what it can be otherwise.*[2] This is the proof then, according to Butler, of the truth of religion and

[1] Chapter on the Moral Government of God, (near the end.)
[2] Conclusion of First Part of Analogy.

the divine moral government, viz. not analogy, but something which analogy supposes, 'an argument which is plainly unanswerable, and would be so, were there no additional confirmation of it from analogy,'—the argument that we have a moral nature, and that, therefore, the existence of a God, the maker of that nature, supposed, His nature and character must be moral too.

It would be a hard task to go into all the mistakes which Mr. Maurice makes, in consequence of supposing, against Butler's own distinct protest, that analogy is the *original* evidence of religion, in his scheme, and not a mere secondary and confirmatory one. But his comparison between Butler's moral system and Mr. Combe's physical one should not be passed over. Mr. Combe proves that the observance of certain physical laws is necessary for the welfare of man, and, therefore, that these laws have, according to the design of the Author of nature, a claim on our attention and obedience, as guides to life. Butler proves the same of moral laws. Mr. Maurice, on a comparison of the evidence brought forward by the two for their respective sets of laws, asserts Mr. Combe's to be based on sure scientific observation, and Butler's on mere guess and presumption; and remarks, 'Whenever guesses are balanced against 'laws, guesses must kick the beam; if divines and moralists 'have nothing but guesses to produce, and Mr. Combe has laws, 'it is not a matter of doubt, but of certainty, that he will be 'the teacher of the world, and that they must make their way 'out of it as fast as they can.'

This comparison is evidently founded on the mistake we have noticed, viz. on Mr. Maurice's idea that analogy is Butler's primary argument for the truth of religion. Analogy being supposed to be his argument, Butler's argument, and Mr. Combe's argument, are both arguments of the same kind; the proofs are the same in both cases: Mr. Combe observes as a fact that certain *physical* antecedents produce certain consequences painful or pleasant; Butler observes, that certain *moral* antecedents, or actions and ways of life, produce certain consequences painful or pleasant. The arguments of the two are therefore, on Mr. Maurice's supposition, arguments of the same kind; they are both of them inductions; and Mr. Combe's induction is a much more correct, accurate and certain one, than Butler's. But Butler's primary argument for the truth of religion is *not* analogy, and implies no induction at all; it is an appeal to our consciousness of a certain moral nature within us in the first place; it is an immediate inference from that moral nature in the next. His and Mr. Combe's, therefore, are different arguments, and cannot be compared.

Indeed, if Mr. Maurice will only reflect, he must see how perfectly inconsistent Butler's whole view of morals is with induction as its basis. Whatever uncertainty may attend Butler's view of morals, he is yet regarded by Mr. Maurice as maintaining morals, in the true sense of that word; *i. e.* as holding a fundamental distinction between good and evil, in actions. But he could not, by possibility, get at such a distinction by induction. In induction we observe facts, and put them together, but we cannot get beyond this colligation or summary of the facts themselves, or get at an internal quality or characteristic of them, such as the moral one. To observe that intemperance, veracity, pride, lying, temperance, honesty, fraud, and many other habits and lines of behaviour, in the department of human life, are connected as antecedents with certain consequences,—such as intemperance with disease, lying with dishonour, veracity with credit, and so on,—is not to arrive at the quality of moral good or evil attaching to these respective ways of acting. That can only be discerned by an internal sense. The argument of the 'Analogy' — we mean the argument put out there, as distinct from any ground presupposed—is indeed one of this simply inductive sort. Nothing being taken for granted with respect to the intrinsic moral good and evil of actions, and without saying that temperance is at all better morally than drunkenness, or veracity than lying, all the actions that take place in human life are in that argument simply looked upon as *facts;* and Butler asserts the present experienced connexion of certain pleasures or pains with them, in the way of antecedent and consequent, exactly as a medical man would connect one physical state or habit with another, or as a chemist would observe that certain results were produced when certain materials were brought together. The argument of the 'Analogy' is thus a purely inductive one; and we will admit further, that as an inductive argument it is much weaker and much less conclusive than Mr. Combe's—simply for this reason, that the facts in Mr. Combe's department are so much more fixed and clear than in Butler's. That some things produce health, and other things produce disease, is a much more uniform connexion of antecedent and consequent than that virtues produce happiness, and vices misery, in this world. It is admitted that the facts in this latter department are not constant; that there is a large disturbance, that evil is often triumphant, and good depressed. And this causes the manifest weakness and poverty of the argumentative result of analogy pure. It cannot be helped. The result is, indeed, as far as it goes, decided. There is a clear balance on the whole in favour of virtue; and that being

the case, a man is as really bound by the result, as if it were a much larger one. Still the facts are inconstant, and the induction must represent the facts. Admitting, however, that the argument of the 'Analogy' is of itself an induction, and that a necessarily poor induction, we repeat that Butler did not rest the evidence of religion on the argument of analogy.

But now we must turn the tables upon Mr. Maurice, and having stood so long on the defensive, must become the accuser on this subject. We have explained what induction is, and its inherent weakness as an argument in morals. But, after charging Bishop Butler with resting morals on a weak and uncertain ground, what does Mr. Maurice do himself but rest the evidence of moral truth upon this very ground—that of induction? This is certainly implied in the following passage, which is given at large, marking what part we especially refer to:—

"'But though there may be this single point of agreement amongst Christian doctors on this subject, are there not the greatest disagreements among them; such disagreements as entirely bear out Mr. Combe's assertion that nothing is settled about the moral or spiritual constitution, while *he* is able to argue from the most certain data respecting the physical?" Before I answer this question, I wish to inquire what those data are, from which Mr. Combe argues, and what is his method of coming at conclusions from them. These data, I conceive, are certain facts respecting the condition of men in different circumstances; respecting their states of health and of disease; respecting the treatment, mischievous and beneficial, which has been applied to them. Such facts have not been merely observed, loosely and carelessly: they have been submitted to a series of searching experiments. There have been experiments on the bodily frame which illustrated those on the influences to which it is exposed; the anatomist, physiologist, chemist, geologist, each contributing his quota of observation and thought, to the confirmation or correction of the other. Thus, after many theories have been accepted, and thrown aside, some simple law has been brought to light, the great test of which has been, its power of explaining facts, new and old; so far as it can do that, it sustains its character; when it fails, it is not discarded, but it is supposed that some deeper, more comprehensive law is yet to reward the toil and humility of the inquirer. What can be better or truer than investigations of this kind? What duty can be greater, than to avail ourselves of the results to which they lead? *But the more we study them and admire them, the less shall we adopt those loose expressions which represent this evidence as something altogether different in kind from that which is open to moralists and divines, if they like to make use of it.* I do not believe that Butler intended to distinguish the probable evidence to which he appeals in his Analogy, from this kind of induction. On the contrary, he is applying the inductive method with the same hesitation and unwillingness to accept hasty generalizations, with the same readiness to look at facts and test them, which characterises the physical inquirer. And he wished his reader to feel how satisfactory that method was, what a guide it was to practical decisions, what a deliverance from mere vague hypotheses.'—*Ibid.* pp. 232—234.

To say that we understand this passage as a whole would, indeed, be boastful. The author thinks that Butler distinguished, though without intending it, probable evidence from

induction. What does he mean? Butler, in the 'Analogy,' founds the probability of a Divine moral government *upon* an induction, *i. e.* observation of present facts. So much, however, is clear, that Mr. Maurice says the argument which moralists and divines ought to use for their conclusions is the argument of induction, which Mr. Combe uses. But what can Mr. Maurice be thinking of, with his dislike of uncertainty, to rest the evidence of religion upon induction? How can he think that a 'satisfactory method' of proof? Will he say Butler has not made so much of it as he might have done? We shall be truly obliged to Mr. Maurice if he will make any more of it. Will he prove what Eliphaz the Temanite, Bildad the Shuhite, and Zophar the Naamathite, wanted to do, that virtue and vice have uniform consequences respectively of pain and happiness in this world? But till he does that, the induction from the facts of this life in favour of the truth of religion, or the ultimate reward of virtue and punishment of vice, must remain a very imperfect one. And, even supposing him to succeed here, a still greater difficulty awaits him. With the most perfect induction as to the consequences of actions in this world, it would be still a mere presumption and no more that there would be the same consequences in another. Religion would rest on the most uncertain basis, if induction were its primary proof.

Again, after objecting so strongly to the uncertainty of Butler's proof in morals, what does Mr. Maurice do but actually charge Butler—and a most serious mistake he thinks it—with too great certainty in that proof? We allude to the remarks on the subject of conscience. Butler thinks that conscience, though liable to be occasionally disturbed by superstition, is, in the main, to be depended on as a guide, and puts it forth as a sound foundation of morals. Mr. Maurice disputes this, and sees in superstition, not that mere exception to, which Butler does, but a general and wholesale proof against, the trustworthiness of conscience.

> 'The student of Butler's doctrine on the Conscience, is often forced even more painfully upon this conclusion. For he will say to himself, "My conscience ought, you say, to be a king. But it is not a king. It is a captive. How shall it be raised to its throne? And when it has got a temporary ascendency, can I trust it? Does not Butler himself admit the possibility of superstition acting upon it, and deranging its decisions? Is that a slight exception to a general maxim? Does not all history show that the decrees of this great ruler may be made contradictory, monstrous, destructive, by this disturbing force, which Butler notices, but hardly deigns to take account of?'—*Ibid.* p. 221.

Who is it here who is throwing doubt and uncertainty upon morals?—Butler, who maintains the trustworthiness of conscience,

or Mr. Maurice, who seems to think conscience a mere guesser, and a very bad one? We have not time or space to enter at present further into this question, which is undoubtedly an important one, or explain how conscience may be an authoritative guide to us in action, though we may know it is not an absolutely infallible one. We shall content ourselves with saying that we think Mr. Maurice greatly exaggerates the errors of conscience, and, over-occupied with the effects of one disturbing force, forgets the many large fields of action on which it is quite clear sighted and not liable to mistakes: and with reminding Mr. Maurice that if he unseats conscience as a guide, he is indeed throwing us on the wide world for any standard of action or rule of life. He may think he has a corrective for this defect which he has discovered in conscience, but it is much easier to pull down than to build up again, and to inflict a wound than to remedy it. His remedy appears, as far as we can understand him, to lie in a certain 'regeneration' of the conscience. 'Christ, the true bridegroom of man's spirit, is ever drawing 'it towards Himself—is holding out to it freedom from evil, and 'the knowledge of Himself as its high reward. Owning Him, 'the man rises out of dark superstitions, out of immoral 'practices; he recognises the fitness of all God's arrangements 'in the physical and moral world; he claims for the body as 'well as the soul a redemption from all which corrupts and 'degrades it.' He enforces this discovery by a prayer of great earnestness:—

'But Thou, O strong Son of God! give Thy servants grace with all boldness to speak of Thee as that Lord of the inner man, in confessing whom each of us knows himself to be a person, knows himself to be a subject: knows that he is meant to rule the turbulent impulses and energies within him, because they are Thine, and have all been redeemed by Thee, and are all consecrated to Thee. Suffer us not to shrink through any shame, or through the desire of being reputed philosophical among philosophical men, or religious among religious men, from making this confession of Thee, seeing that Thou, who didst raise up men in other generations to speak that which was needful for them, hast mercifully awakened some of us to feel, that only in this way can we be saved from sinking into the deepest pit of unbelief, the most practical denial of that conscience, which, yet, not a few are ready to put in the place of Thee.'—*Ibid.* p. 229.

We do not see, in spite of Mr. Maurice's earnestness, any correction here to the doubtfulness which he has thrown over the dictates and guidance of conscience. A 'regenerated' conscience is undoubtedly a better guide than an 'unregenerated' one; but how is a man to know that his conscience is 'regenerated?'

We have thought it right to notice this very groundless attack upon one of our great class-books in morals and philosophy; and now we go to other and more critical portions of

Mr. Maurice's Essays. And first, we shall make some remarks on the Chapter on the Atonement.

Many statements and arguments in this chapter appear to us not only highly dangerous, but positively unsound, and opposed to the doctrine of the Atonement as revealed in Scripture, and always understood in the Church. At the same time we are anxious, in justice to Mr. Maurice, to make a distinction. He appears to us sometimes more unsound as a destroyer than he is as a constructor. He has a bias against all existing forms of opinion, all doctrines in the way in which they are actually held and received, and seems to consider it his special vocation to assail them. But allow him to construct the doctrine himself, and put it out in his own formula, and it will be not so very unlike the original one. In the following passage, he protests against the doctrine of the death of our Saviour as a satisfaction for the penalty of sin. The first portion of it is not his own protest in form, so much as that of certain parties whose scruples and objections to orthodox doctrine these Essays are written to meet, and whose sentiments he here expresses. But, so far as that point is concerned, he avows agreement with their protest; and we must add that we cannot, from the whole context, but regard him as agreeing in the main with the arguments on which it is founded.

'But I admitted that there were grave and earnest protests against much of what is called the Protestant doctrine of the Atonement. "You hold," it is said, "that God had condemned all His creatures to perish, because they had broken His law; that His justice could not be satisfied without an infinite punishment; that that infinite punishment would have visited all men, if Christ, in His mercy to men, had not interposed and offered Himself as the substitute for them; that by enduring an inconceivable amount of anguish, He reconciled the Father, and made it possible for Him to forgive those who would believe. This whole statement," the objector continues, "is based on a certain notion of justice. It professes to explain, on certain principles of justice, what God ought to have done, and what He actually has done. And this notion of justice outrages the conscience, to which you seem to offer your explanation. You often feel that it does. You admit that it is not the kind of justice which would be expected of men. And then you turn round and ask us what we can know of God's justice; how we can tell that it is of the same kind with ours? After arguing with us, to show the necessity of a certain course, you say that the argument is good for nothing; we are not capable of taking it in! Or else you say that the carnal mind cannot understand spiritual ideas. We can only answer, We prefer our carnal notion of justice to your spiritual one. We can forgive a fellow-creature a wrong done to us, without exacting an equivalent for it; we blame ourselves if we do not; we think we are offending against Christ's command, who said, Be ye merciful as your Father in Heaven is merciful, if we do not. We do not feel that punishment is a satisfaction to our minds; we are ashamed of ourselves when we consider it is. We may suffer a criminal to be punished, but it is that we may do him good, or assert a principle. And if that is our object, we do not suffer an innocent person to prevent the guilty from enduring the consequences of his guilt,

by taking them upon himself. Are these moral maxims in our case, or are the opposing maxims moral? If they are moral, should we, because God is much more righteous than we can imagine or understand, attribute to Him what we should consider a very low righteousness, or unrighteousness in us?"

'These questions are asked on all sides of us. It is obvious that they are most deep and awful questions. They touch upon the very principles of morality and godliness. I know well how clergymen persuade themselves that it is right and safe to pass them by. They say, "Such doubts bewilder the minds of our flocks upon a doctrine which is, of all others, the most vital. Let one of these objectors," they say, "go with us to the bedsides of some of the humblest, purest Christians. We will show them those who have grown up from their childhood in love and good works. We will show them penitent Magdalens. The testimony of both will be the same. 'To lose this doctrine, of God having reconciled sinners to Himself, would be to lose everything. Without it we do not care for life here or hereafter. We do not know what life here or hereafter could mean.' Are we to rob such souls as these of their treasure, because some captious people find the casket which contains it disagreeable to their pride—because they cannot bend their reasons to the Cross?"

'I answer, No; you are to defend this treasure to the death. You are to let no man take it from those suffering spirits, or—if you have it—from yourselves. You are to desire that all, you among the rest, should be brought, with all your notions and theories, to the Cross. But what is the treasure which you see your humble, dying saints, grasping with such intense resolution? Is it not the belief which is expressed in our collect for Passion Week, that "God of His tender love towards mankind sent His Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ, to take our flesh upon Him, that all mankind should follow the example of His great humility?" Is not this Love of God, this perfect obedience of Christ to His Father's loving will, the ground of all their confidence, their hope, their humility? Has their confidence, their hope, their humility, anything whatever to do with the theory that has fastened itself to this doctrine of Atonement, and, in many minds, has taken the place of it? Do you hear any allusion to it amidst the pauses of that sepulchral cough? Does the feverish hand clasp yours with thankful joy, when you speak of a Divine justice delighting in infinite punishment? Does the loving, peaceful eye respond to the idea that the Son of God has delivered His creatures from their Father's determination to execute His wrath upon them?

'But go from the dying chamber to the house across the street, or, it may be, to the fashionable withdrawing room below, and there you will find what hold this doctrine has upon your people. There you may hear some religious dowager, with the newspaper, from which she derives her faith and her charity, on the ottoman beside her, denouncing a youth just returned from Cambridge, and, as you enter, imploring your help in delivering him from the horrible scepticism into which he has fallen, respecting the faith which is her only consolation in time and eternity. That faith is *not* in the tender love of God, in the obedience of Christ, in His great humility; it is in the theory of the satisfaction He has offered to offended Sovereignty, or, as she calls it, justice.'—*Ibid*, pp. 137—141.

Here, then, Mr. Maurice plainly refuses to admit the doctrine of our Lord's atonement, in the sense of a satisfaction for the penalty of sin. He asks, 'Does the loving, peaceful eye respond 'to the idea that the Son of God has delivered His creatures 'from their Father's determination to execute His wrath upon

'them?' meaning, of course, that such a doctrine is essentially repugnant to true spiritual thought and feeling. He speaks of 'satisfaction to offended Sovereignty,' *i. e.* to the Divine wrath, as 'a theory' which fashionable dowagers, devoid alike of faith and charity, may hold and repose in; but which the contrition of real penitents thrusts aside as revolting, foreign, and unedifying. But what, may we ask, *is* the doctrine of the Atonement, if it is not the doctrine that Christ's death and sufferings have been accepted as a sacrifice in our behalf; and, whereas our sins would, in the natural course, have brought eternal punishment upon us, this sacrifice has redeemed us from it? We do not say that deliverance from punishment is the only mode of expressing the benefit of the Atonement: that benefit is deliverance from sin as well. The two consequences, indeed, cannot be considered apart, so far as this, that the individual cannot have deliverance from punishment, if he does not exhibit a deliverance from sin too. But the one consequence cannot be regarded as absorbed in the other; nor can we afford to throw aside the deliverance from punishment, as if it had no separate and independent interest to us. All that deliverance from sin can amount to, even if by grace we have cast off our sins, is repentance and reformation. But reformation can only affect our future life; it cannot prevent the sins we have committed. And if those sins remain, how do we escape their natural consequence, unless the atonement of Christ is a special rescue from that consequence—a satisfaction for, and removal of a punishment, which would otherwise have been executed upon us? Accordingly, when Bishop Butler defends the doctrine of 'a Mediator and Redeemer,' this is the doctrine which he defends. 'The Son of God loved us, and gave himself for us, 'with a love which he compares to that of human friendship; 'though, in this case, all comparison must fall infinitely short of 'the thing intended to be illustrated by them. *He interposed* '*in such a manner as was necessary and effectual to prevent that* '*execution of justice upon sinners, which God had appointed should* '*otherwise have been executed upon them;* or in such a manner as 'to prevent that punishment from actually following, which, 'according to the general laws of Divine government, must 'have followed the sins of the world, had it not been for such 'interposition.' If repentance cannot of itself do away with the natural effects of our past sin upon ourselves—a power it is plainly repugnant to revelation to assign to it—we are evidently left without a remedy for those effects, and are still under sentence of eternal punishment, unless the Atonement is what Mr. Maurice denies it to be.

We do not argue, however, with Mr. Maurice. All we are

concerned with, is to show that the doctrine which he impugns is the doctrine of the Atonement as held by the Christian body throughout the world, and supposed and taken for granted by divines in their defences and explanations of it. Indeed, Mr. Maurice almost admits this himself, for he admits it to be the doctrine in defence of which Archbishop Magee wrote his book on the 'Scriptural Doctrine of the Atonement;' and he allows that both parties in the Church accept the doctrine defended in that book.

'Men of the Evangelical school, who did not like Archbishop Magee's book, because they found nothing in it which responded to the witness of their hearts, yet accepted it on the poor calculation that it was a learned book, and might defend what they were pleased to call the outworks of the faith. Men of the Patristic school, who knew how little it accorded with the divinity they most admired, yet argued œconomically, that it might serve the purposes of such an age as ours is, and might confute objectors who did not deserve to be acquainted with any higher truth. I acknowledge the dishonesty and faithlessness of both decisions; I feel most deeply the mischiefs which have followed from both; but I see how much there was to make them plausible. I believe it is only a peculiar discipline, and some very painful experience, which has led me to abandon them, and to say boldly, I must give up Archbishop Magee, for I am determined to keep that which makes the Atonement precious to my heart and conscience; to keep the theology of the Creeds and the Bible.'—*Ibid.* pp. 148, 149.

Whatever reasons, then, he may give for their respective approvals, the fact is admitted that men of the Evangelical school, and men of the Patristic school,—that is to say, the whole of the Church,—accept that doctrine of the Atonement which Archbishop Magee defends; while he has 'been led by 'painful experience to say boldly, I must give up Archbishop 'Magee.'

The arguments in apparent deference to which the received doctrine of the Atonement is thus rejected, are the ordinary arguments of Sceptics and Deists, which we meet with in the controversial treatises of divines who have undertaken the defence of the doctrine of the Atonement. There is the argument drawn from the Divine benevolence, that it is unworthy of the Divine nature to suppose that God does not forgive sin simply upon repentance, without the condition of atonement and mediation. There is the argument drawn from the Divine justice, which, it is supposed, is contradicted by making an innocent man suffer for a guilty one. There is an argument against all punishment, as being a sort of vengeance. Our first remark on these arguments is, that it would have been more satisfactory if Mr. Maurice had distinctly stated how far he agreed with them and how far he did not. As it is, he puts forth certain arguments with a great appearance of sympathy; he accepts the result to which those arguments lead, in the minds of the

parties whom he represents; and he puts forward for this result no other arguments as his own in their stead. We do not say that these are, under such circumstances, to be regarded as Mr. Maurice's own arguments; but this we must say, that for a Professor of Theology in a Church of England College to treat with the greatest apparent sympathy and respect a class of arguments which are known as the common arguments of Sceptics and Deists, without even stating dissent from them, or giving his readers any mark by which to separate the sentiments of the represented parties from those of their mouth-piece, is, if it is not an appropriation of those arguments, an inattention to what was due to his position as a Theological Professor in the Church of England.

Our next remark is, that as the Essay advances this ambiguity is somewhat lessened—to the satisfaction of the reader so far as he wants to know what Mr. Maurice's own arguments are—to his grief inasmuch as he finds that Mr. Maurice's own arguments are but too like in character those of which he was the mouth-piece. He says,—

'What we have a right to insist on is, that no notion or theory shall be allowed to interfere with this fundamental maxim, that if any one, by any means, leads us to suppose that Christ did not simply submit to the will of His Father, and carry it out, but sought to move it or change it, he shall be held to have departed from the faith once delivered to the saints.'—*Ibid.* p. 144.

Again:—

'The Scripture says, "The Lamb of God taketh away the *Sin* of the world." All orthodox teachers repeat the lesson. They say Christ came to deliver sinners from sin. This is what the sinner asks for. Have we a right to call ourselves scriptural or orthodox, if we change the words, and put "penalty of sin" for "sin;" if we suppose that Christ destroyed the connexion between sin and death—the one being the necessary wages of the other—for the sake of benefiting any individual man whatever? If He had, would He have magnified the Law and made it honourable? Would He not have destroyed that which He came to fulfil? Those who say the law must execute itself,—it must have its penalty—should remember their own words How does it execute itself if a person, against whom it is not directed, interposes to bear its punishment?'—*Ibid.* p. 146.

These are arguments which Mr. Maurice himself brings against the Atonement as effecting a delivery from a sentence of punishment which would otherwise have been executed. He says first that to suppose this is to suppose that '*Christ sought to move and change*' the Father's will; and secondly, to suppose that Christ destroyed the connexion between sin and death, and so violated, instead of fulfilling, the law. Both these are rationalistic arguments. A change in the will of God, such as ıpposed in the doctrine of the Atonement, is of course a ɔry. We do not mean to say that God's will is changed ɔ sense in which a human will is; that would be repugnant

to our idea of the Divine Nature. We only use such language as a way of expressing some act of the Deity, which cannot really be expressed. Not to allow such modes of expression as these is rationalism; because it is a clear limiting of the truths of religion to such truths as we can understand. The same answer may be made to the argument that Christ did not destroy the connexion between sin and death. Let it be said—which is not true—that our natural idea of justice demands that real guilt should be punished, just as it demands that real virtue should be rewarded; while the doctrine of the Atonement represents real guilt as let off its just punishment. Still this is only a mode of speaking. It is the expression of a mystery to which our thoughts cannot reach, and which is only expressed in this language, because there is no language by which it can be truly and adequately expressed.

We have been viewing Mr. Maurice as an assailant, and we find him not very tender about the arguments he uses. It seems to be *quocunque modo rem.* He appears to regard established forms of belief as things to be knocked down; as so many incrustations, harsh and artificial, which surround the essential truth, and exclude the mind from access to it. But after knocking down the established formula, when he comes to give his own, we find that it does not substantially so much differ from the established one. Mr. Maurice, we find then, is no rationalist, though he could use rationalist arguments before. It makes all the difference in this respect, whether he is the destroyer or the constructor. His own edifice is sacred, and no rationalist even wishes to touch it. He has found a formula which is open to none of the objections to which the established one was, while it does not gain this security by any concession; which satisfies reason much more, while it exercises faith quite as much. After laying down various principles, he concludes,—

'Supposing all these principles gathered together; supposing the Father's will to be a will to all good; the Son of God, being one with Him, and Lord of man, to obey and fulfil in our flesh that will by entering into the lowest condition into which men had fallen through their sin;—supposing this Man to be, for this reason, an object of continual complacency to His Father, and that complacency to be fully drawn out by the Death of the Cross; is not this, in the highest sense, Atonement? Is not the true, sinless root of Humanity revealed; is not God in Him reconciled to man? May not that reconciliation be proclaimed as a Gospel to all men?'—*Ibid.* p. 147.

If this passage means, what it appears to do, that the life and death of our Lord, regarded as one sacrifice, are perfectly pleasing and acceptable to the Father, and that for the sake of that life and death He is reconciled to or forgives the sins of man, we must confess we do not see the great difference between

Mr. Maurice's doctrine and that which he has been so strongly impugning; nor can we see exactly the reason why this Essay has been written. This Essay is written to show that the ordinary idea of the doctrine of the Atonement, the idea, viz. that our Lord 'has delivered His creatures from their Father's determination to execute His wrath upon them'—the idea 'of satisfaction to offended Sovereignty'—is erroneous, and contrary to our fundamental notions of the Divine Nature; he has declared his sympathy with the objections of Socinians to this doctrine, and made common cause with them against it. But if his own formula to express the Atonement is to bear its natural meaning, what does it amount to but to this very doctrine? It supposes God to be offended with man, and asserts His wrath to be appeased and removed by Christ's life and death. 'God is reconciled' to man in consequence of His delight in the Life and Death of the Incarnate Son. Does Mr. Maurice imagine that he has satisfied the scruples of Socinians against the doctrine of the Atonement, by the substitution of such a formula as this for the one he impugns? If he does, with all deference to his knowledge of Socinian grounds of scruple, we cannot but think him mistaken as to what the ground of scruple in the minds of Socinians to the doctrine of the Atonement really is. This ground of scruple is a general one against the *vicarious* principle in moral and divine things. They do not see in reason, why one being's goodness should make any difference in the Divine regards towards another being; why God, being offended with man on account of his own acts, should be reconciled with him on account of Christ's? But Mr. Maurice's formula acknowledges the vicarious principle, as much as the established one does. His language is, that God, in consequence of His delight in the obedient, is reconciled to the disobedient. Nor does he avoid the vicarious principle implied in this language, by speaking of our Lord as 'the sinless root of humanity;' as if man were pardoned in consequence of something within himself, and not external to him. For the Socinian will say, 'What is this mysticsm? I 'do not understand it: it is contrary to my common sense to 'regard one man as the root of another. Every man is his 'own root, and must rise upon the basis of his individuality.' He will see that this language only expresses the vicarious principle under another form.

We shall go now to the subject, which, though occupying but a small space in these Essays, has furnished the principal charge against Mr. Maurice, has filled the correspondence between him and Dr. Jelf, and has supplied the avowed ground r the Professor's dismissal from his office—we mean, the bject of eternal punishments. We enter on such a question

with great reluctance, but as one already agitated, brought into public discussion, and obtruded upon the attention of the whole world, we cannot avoid noticing it; though we see, as clearly as any one, the evil of bringing so deep and mysterious a doctrine into the common field, and subjecting it to ordinary criticism; and cannot therefore but express our deep regret that Mr. Maurice should have thought it necessary to bring it forward, and excite a controversy about it. We agree with Dr. Jelf in saying, that there does not appear to be any general disposition in the present day to use this doctrine uncharitably. The Church preaches the doctrine which Holy Scripture has given to her, that the finally impenitent will be eternally punished; but who are the finally impenitent, she does not profess to know, and she warns her children against any other use of the doctrine than such as is edifying to themselves, and sharpens the wholesome principle of fear, as regards their own salvation.

Mr. Maurice's declarations of opinion on this subject are such as prevent, we confess, any surprise at the step which the Council of King's College has taken. The Church of England allows, it is true, considerable latitude to her members, and even to her teachers, in their mode of holding and expressing various important truths. Such a liberty nobody would wish to destroy; but there are, though not very clearly defined, certain recognised limits to this liberty. It is felt when a man has transgressed these, has violated truths which the general body holds to be sacred, and has departed from the recognised ground and standard of the Church. The results connected with such a question as the present, too, come home with peculiar and alarming force to men's minds; the connexion between error of doctrine and of practice is more immediate and more visible in the case of this doctrine, than in that of some others as near to the foundation of the faith. Nor could the Council be expected to regard with any other feelings than those of the deepest alarm, the teaching of a professor, who inculcated upon a rising generation of clergy Preachers and expounders of Scripture, from which future congregations were to receive Christian instruction, an interpretation of Scripture which wholly unsettled, if it did not overthrow, the powerful sanctions of religion contained in the doctrine of eternal punishment.

The objections ordinarily made to the doctrine of the eternity of future punishments, are made upon what—to use the word in a somewhat large and mixed sense—we may call a moral ground; that is to say, upon the ground of the repugnancy of such a doctrine to the Divine Attributes. It is urged that eternal punishment is contrary to the Divine Love. Or if that objection is seen not to be valid, inasmuch as the Divine Love

is not inconsistent with the punishment of an evil being, and eternal punishment supposes the being punished to be eternally evil; another is made on the ground of the Divine *Power*. It is urged that Almighty Power must be able to stop this moral evil in His creatures.

But this is not Mr. Maurice's ground of objection to the doctrine of eternal punishment. He betrays some tenderness on this latter point, and expressions which he uses every now and then show a considerable inclination toward the position that eternal punishment is positively inconsistent with the Divine Attributes. Indeed, we can give no other meaning to the concluding passage of the 'Essays,' to which great attention has been called.

'We do not want theories of Universalism; they are as cold, hard, unsatisfactory, as all other theories. But we want that clear, broad assertion of the Divine Charity which the Bible makes, and which carries us immeasurably beyond all that we can ask or think. What dreams of ours can reach to the assertion of St. John, that Death and Hell themselves shall be cast into the lake of fire? I cannot fathom the meaning of such expressions. But they are written; I accept them, and give thanks for them. I feel there is an abyss of Death, into which I may sink, and be lost. Christ's Gospel reveals an abyss of Love, below that; I am content to be lost in that. I know no more, but I am sure that there is a woe on us if we do not preach this Gospel, if we do not proclaim the name of the Father, the Son, and the Spirit,—the Eternal Charity.'—*Ibid.* pp. 442, 443.

In this passage, though he first says that we do not want theories of Universalism, he proceeds immediately, if his language is to have its natural meaning, to give one. For he says that there is *below* that 'abyss of death in which he may sink and be lost,' an abyss of love. An abyss of love must be a state of salvation; and therefore the ultimate state appears, according to this passage, to be a state of salvation exclusively. But his language elsewhere avoids decision on this point. The spiritual mind he says—

'Feels that God is altogether Love, Light with no darkness at all. But then that which is without God, that which loves darkness, that which resists love, must not it be miserable? And can it not fix itself in misery? Has it not a power of defying that which seeks to subdue it? I know in myself that it has. I know that we may struggle with the Light, that we may choose death. But I know also, that Love does overcome this rebellion. I know that I am bound to believe, that its power is greater than every other. I am sure that Christ's death proves that death, hell, hatred, are not so strong as their opposites. How can I reconcile these contradictory discoveries? I cannot reconcile them. I know no theory which can. But I can trust in Him, who has reconciled the world to Himself. I can leave all in His hands. I dare not fix any limits to the power of His love. I cannot tell what are the limits to the power of a rebel will. I know that no man can be blessed, except his will is in accordance with God's will. I know it must be by an action on the will that love triumphs. Though I have no faith in man's theory of Universal Restitution, I am

taught to expect "a restitution of all things, which God who cannot lie has promised since the world began." I am obliged to believe that we are living in a restored order. I am sure that restored order will be carried out by the full triumph of God's loving will. How that should take place while any rebellious will remains in the universe I cannot tell, though it is not for me to say that it is impossible. I do not want to say it. I wish to trust God absolutely, and not to trust in any conclusion of my own understanding at all.'—*Dr. Jelf's Pamphlet*, pp. 7, 8.

There are leanings here, we say, toward the position which we mentioned, that of an universal irresistible grace. But Mr. Maurice keeps these in check, and does not give way to them. He speaks more strongly against any dogma in such a direction, in his final Letter.

'What I dare not pronounce upon is the *fact* that every will in the universe must be brought into consent with the Divine will. Stating the proposition as you state it, I should indeed tremble to affirm the contrary, and I think any man would. Dare you make it a positive article of faith that God's will, being what the Scripture says it is, shall *not* finally triumph? Nevertheless there is such a darkness over the whole question of the possible resistance of the human will, that I must be silent, and tremble and adore.'—*Maurice's Letter*, p. 16.

Mr. Maurice, then, does not take the ground which has been ordinarily taken against the doctrine of eternal punishments, and refuses to decide upon any inconsistency of the Divine Attributes with the doctrine. We are glad to admit this, though at the same time we will just remind him of one argumentative result of such a scrupulousness. The texts of Scripture declaring the eternal punishment of the wicked are so decisive and plain, that they must be taken to mean what they appear to do, unless some positive ground of reason or morals can be shown against it. The arguer upon the Divine Attributes professes to have such a ground, and therefore can, if his ground is proved, treat these texts as explained away, or proved not to mean that which they apparently do. But if an arguer can only say that he is doubtful as to the consequences of the Divine Attributes on this subject, he has no ground derived from this quarter against the apparent meaning of these texts: and in the absence of any reason against the plain meaning of the texts, that meaning must be admitted.

Mr. Maurice's ground against eternal punishments, in the common understanding of that term, lies in the sense itself of the word eternal, which he conceives to have been mistaken by the world at large, and which he himself thinks to be a sense necessarily disconnected with any idea of time or duration. Accordingly he does not require any argument for the purpose of explaining away a meaning admitted to be the apparent meaning of these texts. The apparent meaning itself of these texts is to him a meaning wholly disconnected with any idea

of time or duration. "I believe that we must take the words of Scripture literally,' he says, and their literal meaning, he adds, is one thus wholly removed from the popular one. And he appeals to Scripture for his proof:—

'The word "eternal," if what I have said is true, is a key-word of the New Testament. To draw our minds from the temporal, to fix them on the eternal, is the very aim of the divine economy. How much ought we, then, to dread any confusion between thoughts which our Lord has taken such pains to keep distinct,—which our consciences tell us ought to be kept distinct! How dangerous to introduce the notion of duration into a word from which He has deliberately excluded it! And yet this is precisely what we are in the habit of doing, and it is this which causes such infinite perplexity to our minds. "Try to conceive," the teacher says, "a thousand years. Multiply these by a thousand, by twenty thousand, by a hundred thousand, by a million. Still you are as far off from eternity as ever." Certainly I am, quite as far. Why then did you give me that sum to work out? What could be the use of it, except to bewilder me, except to make me disbelieve in Eternity altogether? Do you not see that this course must be utterly wrong and mischievous? If eternity is the great reality of all, and not a portentous fiction, how dare you impress such a notion of fictitiousness on my mind as your process of illustration conveys? "But is it not the only process?"—Quite the only one, so far as I see, if you will bring Time into the question; if you will have years, and centuries, to prevent you from taking in the sublime truth, "This is life eternal, to know God."

'For what, then, is Death Eternal, but to be without God? What is that infinite dread which rises upon my mind, which I cannot banish from me, when I think of my own godlessness and lovelessness,—that I may become wholly separated from Love; become wholly immersed in selfishness and hatred? What dread can I have—ought I to have—besides this? What other can equal this? Mix up with this, the consideration of days, and years, and millenniums, you add nothing either to my comfort or my fears. All you do is to withdraw me from the real cause of my misery, which is my separation from the source of life and peace; from the hope which must come to me in one place or another, if I can again believe in God's love, and cast myself upon it.'—*Maurice's Essays*, pp. 436, 437.

So completely does he dissociate the meaning of eternity from any idea of duration, that he actually supposes eternity may end. The reader must defer a logical comment, which will occur to him upon this mode of speaking. He says:—

'My duty then I feel is this, 1st. To assert that which I know, that which God has revealed, His absolute universal love in all possible ways, and without any limitation. 2d. To tell myself and all men, that to know this love and to be moulded by it is *the* blessing we are to seek. 3d. To say that this is eternal life. 4th. To say that the want of it is eternal death. 5th. To say that if they believe in the Son of God they have eternal life. 6th. To say that if they have not the Son of God they have not life. 7th. *Not* to say who has not the Son of God, because I do not know. *8th. Not to say how long any one may remain in eternal death, because I do not know. 9th. Not to say that all will necessarily be raised out of eternal death, because I do not know.*'—*Dr. Jelf's Pamphlet*, p. 8.

Eternity having thus, in Mr. Maurice's opinion, nothing to do with our idea of time and duration, he wholly rejects the

common and popular idea of eternal punishments as eternal in the sense of duration; he considers that sense as not only not intended by Scripture, but positively prohibited, and he is prepared to inculcate and propagate such a prohibition, as an essential part of the Gospel revelation.

Now upon such a mode of treating the word 'eternal' as this, the first observation we must make, is, that it appears to deprive that word altogether of any meaning which can be in the slightest degree perceived and apprehended by the human mind. The word eternal is obviously used in Scripture with reference to some meaning which the hearer can annex to it; and that, we will add, a meaning by no means far removed from ordinary comprehension. We say comprehension, not forgetting, of course, that the meaning is in its fulness incomprehensible; but only intending to say, that a meaning of some kind is supposed in Scripture to be immediately suggested by the word, and to rise up instinctively in a hearer's mind, even the most unlearned and uncultivated one. The texts in which mankind are warned of eternal punishments in a future state, are evidently addressed to the whole of mankind, and meant to convey a particular meaning to the natural and average understanding of man. But if the meaning of eternal is to be entirely dissociated with the idea of duration, the word eternal ceases to have any meaning, which any man, learned or unlearned, can possibly in the remotest way apprehend. For what is the idea of eternity which is left, when all idea of it as duration is taken away? None. There is no idea in our minds, when we think of the word. There is absolute vacancy, and our mental interior is literally empty.

It may be said that we have the idea of simple existence; and that that idea of pure existence, abstracted from all idea of time, is the legitimate meaning of eternal. And something like this we understand to be Mr. Maurice's meaning. But such an assertion will not bear examination. If I think of existence at all, I cannot think of it but as the existence of something or other; nor can I think of that something's existence, but as continuing or not continuing. You may tell me to think of existence absolutely, and to remove that foreign and irrelevant addition of duration, long or short, ending or not ending, that I have attached artifically to it; but if you do, you are simply imposing a task on me which the laws of human thought wholly disable me from fulfilling. I find in attempting to do so, that I simply make my mind empty, and my meaning nothing. If the idea of eternity then is reduced to the idea of pure existence, independent of duration, it is reduced to an idea which I have not got within my mind. And the notices of an eternal state in Scripture, so far from appealing to the

plain average understanding of the human race, and being met by an instinctive meaning in our minds, find simply no response at all, and excite no idea whatever.

But our next observation must be that Mr. Maurice *does* give a meaning to the word 'eternal,' a meaning *contradictory* to the idea which we naturally assign to it. After protesting against any association of duration at all with eternity, Mr. Maurice uses language, which, in its natural acceptation, plainly associates duration with it, only speaking of that duration as possibly a limited one, instead of being necessarily endless. 'I feel it my duty,' he says, 'not to say *how long any one may remain in eternal death*,' i.e. in a state of eternal punishment. Is not eternity here spoken of as time, and capable of a limit? What are the ideas which Mr. Maurice has before his mind, when he writes this sentence? First, he has evidently an idea of some space of time before eternal punishment begins; secondly, he has an idea of a space of time during which eternal punishment lasts; and thirdly, of a space of time which succeeds that. What is this but eternity positively embedded in time, bounded by time before, and time to come? It is not only duration, but limited duration. The sentence following comes under the same observation, 'I feel it my duty not to say that all will necessarily be raised out of eternal death.' So then, Mr. Maurice has the idea, that in some cases, at any rate, men will be punished eternally, and after having been punished eternally, will enter another state and condition. That is to say, he first puts forward a transcendentally subtle idea of eternity, as pure existence without duration; and when he comes to apply it, he plunges into the very thick of time, and makes his eternity an intelligibly limited period. If this is the practical working, however, of a philosophy which professes to raise and refine the popular conceptions on this subject, we should, at any rate, recommend the adoption of another language; for, indeed, Mr. Maurice must allow us to tell him that it is eccentric to speak of eternity as ending.

The ground, it would appear, of this whole interpretation of the word 'eternal' is the assumption, that our idea of time is not only not an adequate exponent—which none would assert it to be—but no exponent *at all* of eternity. But this is, indeed, a hasty assumption. Undoubtedly, if we have nothing in our idea of time to give us the least notion of what eternity is, it follows immediately that the latter is purely unintelligible, and that we take unauthorized and fictitious means for explaining it, when we put it before our minds in any way as time. But we wholly dissent from the ground, that our idea of time is to be regarded as no exponent at all of what eternity is. It is an inadequate and

poor one, but it would be a great error to consider that it was designed to do nothing at all for us toward this object, that it was to be wholly separated from eternity in our thoughts, and that we ought to think of the latter as if there were no such idea as the former in our minds, *i.e.* to entertain no conception of it at all. We are expressly commanded to think of ourselves as existing beyond the grave; but we cannot think of ourselves as existing except in time. Then it is evidently intended that we should carry our ideas of time beyond the grave; only using such salvos and qualifications as reason suggests should be used in such a case. If this is forbidden us, God has imposed an impossible duty upon us.

If any one will be at the pains to examine his idea of time, he will find it to be by no means an inferior, sensual, or narrow idea. It is not like the idea of this or that particular external object. There is an evident distinction between it and the whole class of ideas which come in through senses, which proves a higher source. And that which gives it this distinction, and proves this higher and supersensual source, is the idea of infinity, which is involved in our idea of time.

The idea of infinity, with which we find ourselves endowed, is a very remarkable and peculiar idea, for this reason, that, while it is undoubtedly a true and in some sort apprehended one, it is at the same time only a preliminary and incipient idea, vanishing while we are upon its very threshold, and launching us upon the unknown and unconceived. We cannot rid ourselves of this idea of infinity; we cannot think of anything at all, but we may imagine that thing repeated once, twice, three times, three thousand times, till we exhaust ourselves with numbers; and then we feel ourselves as far from the goal as ever. Thus space widens on all sides of us into boundless space, and time stretches into an infinite time anterior and prospective. We cannot prevent the mind from exceeding the bounds of the objects and the sphere of its actual experience; because there is that in us which is ever growing and necessarily expanding, without capacity of check; and when we get to the very furthest horizon, we feel an action of excess or stretching over going on within our minds. But while we stretch over, we just stretch over, and no more. We cannot grasp that quantity and extent which lies beyond. It is unknown magnitude, unknown number. The idea of infinity is a true and an apprehended, but only an incipient idea, and Locke's distinction is a true one, in meaning, whatever defect there may be in his mode of expressing it, that we have an idea of infinity of space and time, but not an idea of space and time infinite. 'The idea of infinity,' he says, 'has something of positive in all those things we apply it to.

'When we would think of infinite space or duration, we at 'first step usually make some very large idea, as perhaps of 'millions of ages, or miles, which possibly we double and mul- 'tiply several times. All that we thus amass together in our 'thoughts is positive, and the assemblage of a great number of 'positive ideas of space or duration. But what still remains 'beyond this, we have no more a positive and distinct notion of, 'than a mariner has of the depth of the sea; where, having let 'down a large portion of his sounding line, he reaches no 'bottom: whereby he knows the depth to be so many fathoms 'and more; but how much the more is, he hath no distinct notion 'at all; and could he always supply a new line, and find the 'plummet always sink without ever stopping, he would be 'something in the posture of the mind reaching after a complete 'and positive idea of infinity. In which case, let this line be 'ten, or one thousand fathoms long, it equally discovers what 'is beyond it; and gives only this confused and comparative idea, 'that this is not all, but one may yet go farther. So much as 'the mind comprehends of any space, it has a positive idea of; 'but in endeavouring to make it infinite, it being always 'enlarging, always advancing, the idea is still imperfect and 'incomplete. ... For to say a man has a positive clear idea of any 'quantity, without knowing how great it is, is as reasonable as 'to say, he has the positive clear idea of the number of the 'sands on the sea shore, who knows not how many there be; 'but only that they are more than twenty. For just such a 'perfect and positive idea has he of an infinite space and dura- 'tion, who says it is larger than the extent and duration of ten, 'one hundred, one thousand, or any other number of miles or 'years, whereof he has or can have a positive idea; which is all 'the idea, I think, we have of infinite. So that what lies 'beyond our positive idea towards infinity, lies in obscurity; and 'has the indeterminate confusion of a negative idea, wherein I 'know I neither can nor do comprehend all I would, it being 'too large for a finite and narrow capacity: and that cannot 'but be very far from a positive and complete idea, wherein 'the greatest of what I would comprehend is left out, under 'the indeterminate intimation of being still greater.'—*Locke's Essay*, book ii. ch. 17.

Such is the idea of infinity which we find in our minds, and from such an account we first infer that this idea is a true, solid, and constitutional part of our minds, and not a fantastic and fictitious conceit; and next, that it is what may be called a mysterious idea, or one of which we have only an incipient apprehension; which very dimness and imperfection is a result of its rank, because it is dim, and is imperfectly apprehended,

only because it is out of proportion with the rest of our minds; because it is the threshold of a higher range of capacities, the border line where our limited reason mingles for an instant with, and just tastes the greatness of another form and other laws of conception. Let no one suppose, that because this idea is concerned with simple magnitude and quantity, that therefore it is not an idea of high rank; a man may think so for a moment, but the voice of nature will the next moment correct his fastidious criticism, and tell him that nature, reasonable and intellectual nature, admires magnitude. Whence it is, or how it is, we know not, but the very inner mind swells with the idea of extent and number, and feels in the contemplation of them a satisfaction to a certain innate ambition and high desire. The vastness of space, and the interminable lengths of time, fill us with awe, not only with reference to the objects and events there may be residing in them, but an awe excited by their own simple infinity. Every step in the world of magnitudes and extents is full of wonder, and the mind is subdued as in the presence of supernatural forms and powers.

We find, then, in our minds, an idea, such as Locke describes, a dim, indistinct, and mysterious idea of infinity; and that, consequently, we necessarily think of time as infinite. The inference is that we have in our idea of time something which is exponent of eternity, and adapted to represent it to our minds. The infinity of time is representative of eternity, so far as eternity is simply endless and boundless. You say that eternity is a mystery, and that therefore time is no exponent at all of it. But time is a mystery too; you do not think of that. We have not to go to another world for mysteries. Simple astronomical infinite time is a mystery; its quantity is incomprehensible; we have not, as Locke says, the idea of it. But a mysterious idea is, so far as we apprehend it, the fit exponent of a mystery —the mystery of eternity. We are let into the secret of infinity here, and something about eternity is already revealed to us in our natural reason.

But Mr. Maurice, as it appears to us, does not at the very outset do justice to this idea of time; and his mistaken conclusion seems to follow very naturally from this mistake at the outset. He acknowledges, indeed, that we have an idea of infinity and of infinite duration, but he speaks of it more as if it were a grotesque, fictitious, and fanciful conceit, than a solid, true, and noble part of our minds. He says,—

'I cannot apply the idea of time to the word eternal. I feel that I cannot. Every body feels it. What do the continual experiments to heap hundreds of thousands of years upon hundreds of thousands of years, and then the confession, "after all we are no nearer to eternity," mean, if not

this? Do they not show that we are not even on the way to the idea of eternity? Might we not just as well have stopped at the hundredth year, or the first? But this trifling becomes very serious and shocking, if there is a great and awful idea of eternity which our Lord would teach us, which belongs to our inmost selves, and which we are flying from by these efforts to get it into another region.'—*Letter of Mr. Maurice in Dr. Jelf's Pamphlet*, p. 6.

'I am met with the complaint, that there is a simple, natural, admitted meaning of the word "eternal" which every one understands, and which I am trying to get rid of. I ask for that simple, natural, admitted meaning, and I find it full of the strangest complexities and incoherences; one which cannot be set before simple people, without the most extraordinary devices to make it intelligible; devices which utterly fail, by the admission of those who resort to them.'—*Ibid.* pp. 13, 14.

He throws aside our idea of infinity as in itself a low absurd and mean idea; it is 'full of complexities and incoherences;' he sees in the representations of it that we make to our minds only 'extraordinary devices;' as if the whole were a mere Chinese trick and puzzle. Undoubtedly the idea of infinity is a dim and indistinct idea, and we find in pursuing it apparent complexities and incoherences. But will any sane person deny on proper reflection, that the idea of infinity is a true, a lawful, and a grand idea of our intellectual nature? Undoubtedly 'we heap hundreds of thousands of years upon hundreds of thousands, and yet are no nearer to eternity;' but is infinite number a fictitious and mean idea? And because this idea of infinity falls short and owns its deficiency, is it not, as far as it goes, true knowledge, true perception? Do we apprehend no truth whatever, in any way whatever, in any degree whatever, when we have the idea of infinity in our minds? Are the ideas of infinity and nothing identical? Is it absurd to speak of an idea of infinity at all? Certainly this is not the case. All are conscious of the possession of a truth, a majestic truth, in this idea, though we feel ourselves but on the threshold of it, and cannot by possibility grasp that of which it tells us the existence. If Mr. Maurice, however, will not acknowledge any truth in our idea of infinity at all, it is no wonder that he should deny that our idea of time is any exponent of eternity; for our idea of time can only be such an exponent as involving the idea of infinity.

Upon this radical mistake rises the objection of Mr. Maurice to the term 'endless,' or 'never ending,' as applied to a future life.

'Here we have your meaning of Eternal and Everlasting. You are not really pleading for either of the words which our translators have used. You are measuring both by a compound "endless" or "never ending" which they have not used at all. Now thus it seems to me you bring us under the conditions of Time in the most mischievous way. The "measures of duration" which you try to escape, by speaking of an absolute duration, may be used—are used in Scripture—to raise us above notions of Time.

"I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last;" "the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever;" "which is, and was, and is to come," are forms of speech which do not chain us to a beginning or an end, to yesterday or to-day, to the past, to the present, or the future; but teach us of One who is living in these "measures of duration," and is not confined by them. But mere negative words, such as "endless," "never ending," start from a ground of Time; when I predicate them of God, I make him a mere negation of Time; I conceive of Him just as the Magians did, as "Time without Bounds." '—*Maurice's Letter*, pp. 7, 8.

The argument in this passage, as far as we can make it out, supposes that time is essentially limited in our idea of it; from which it follows that if we think of it as endless, we are entertaining 'a negation of time.' If this is *not* his supposition, we cannot conceive what he means by saying that 'endless time,' that 'time without bounds' is a negation of time! Is an infinite quantity of brick or stone, a negation of brick or stone? Is an infinite quantity of time a negation of time? If this *is* his supposition, we need not say how erroneous it is.

We have appealed to the idea of the infinite in our minds, as the true and intended guide in forming our notion of eternity, and referred Mr. Maurice's mistaken conclusion, on the subject before us, to his mistaken estimate of this idea. We do not mean to say, however, that this idea is of itself at all an adequate exponent of eternity. There is undoubtedly a great defect in an image of eternity which represents it as, however infinite, consisting of successive spaces of time. And this defect, though it cannot be remedied,—for we cannot think of time except under the mode of succession,—ought to be remembered in applying our idea of infinity to eternal duration. But this defect in the idea does not exclude it altogether as an exponent to us of eternity, but only qualify it. The *elements* of infinite duration have to be disposed in a different way from that in which we find the elements of present time to be; but the infinity *itself* of that duration is still truly represented to our minds by our idea of that time as infinite. And upon this basis the definition of eternity accepted in the middle ages was formed—*Interminabilis vitæ tota simul et perfecta possessio.* It is the definition given by Boëtius, and adopted by Aquinas. Here first comes the idea of pure endlessness, infinity of duration. That is the leading and primary idea; eternity is *vita interminabilis.* But inasmuch as an infinite duration, going on, as present time goes, by a succession of moments, each in turn leaving the other behind; inasmuch as the arrangement of past, present, and future is obviously unsuitable to eternity, this point is next looked to; it is added that the contents of the 'interminable life' have the mode not of succession but of simultaneity, and that the whole of infinite duration is possessed at once—*tota simul.*

When Mr. Maurice, then, demands that eternity should be regarded, not as successive duration, but as a 'fixed state,' 'a state subject to no change or succession,' he is right; but why should he demand this characteristic, as he does, *in opposition to* the other? Why should the changelessness of the eternal state supersede its endlessness? He says, 'The word *αἰὼν*, *ætas*, 'specially serves this purpose. Like our own word "Period," 'it does not convey so much the impression of a line as of a 'circle; it does not suggest perpetual progress, but fixedness 'and completeness. The word *αἰώνιος*, or *æternus*, derived from 'this, seems to have been divinely contrived to raise us out of 'our time-notions—to suggest the thought of One who is the 'same yesterday, to-day, and for ever.' All this may be so. But why should a particular mode in which infinite duration exists, exclude that duration's infinity; and the duration, because it is *tota simul*, not be '*interminabilis*.' It is evident that we can form no conception of such a state of being; but in the natural order of our thoughts, the idea of eternity as infinite comes first; the fixedness is only a characteristic of such infinity, to distinguish it from an infinity of earthly duration. Earthly time is in idea infinite, but it is an infinity of passing moments; this is unsuitable to the heavenly state, and therefore we pronounce the latter to be a fixed and permanent infinity; but it still is infinity. Mr. Maurice appeals to S. Augustine's description of eternity, as *semper stans*, and contrasted in that respect to the succession of past, present, and future in this life; but the *semper stans* of Augustine, like the *tota simul* of Boëtius, supposes the endlessness of eternity, and does not exclude it. He might, had he thought it worth while, have claimed, with greater right, the authority of Cudworth, who appears to deny the possibility of infinity in material things, and so to condemn the common idea of infinity altogether as spurious; though he nowhere pushes his extravagant principles, on this question, to a definite conclusion.

We have endeavoured to point out, and show the error of, the ground on which Mr. Maurice appears to have founded his interpretation of the word 'eternal.' If we are wrong, however, in our conjecture as to what that ground is, we can only—claiming some indulgence for a misapprehension not unpardonable in a criticism upon a writer whose depth is certainly out of proportion with his perspicuity—fall back upon our first objection, that, upon whatever ground this interpretation may be raised, it is one which deprives the word 'eternal' of all meaning which the human mind can embrace or entertain. This is a fatal objection; but a simple negation of all meaning is,—however bad a consequence in the case of a word evidently intended in Scripture to produce the most forcible impression

upon us—far from being the worst consequence of such an interpretation. Such a negation of meaning would, practically speaking, issue in a meaning but too definite and positive; and this interpretation would no sooner pass from the minds of philosophers and theologians, to those of common men, than it would become a simple doctrine of the limitation of future punishment. It has hardly escaped this further stage in Mr. Maurice's own hands; and still less would it do so, under the treatment which the mass would give it. Imagine a doctrine of eternal punishment pervading the world at large, which asserted that eternal did *not* mean 'endless,' or 'everlasting;' what is the immediate meaning which *would* be given to the word? The difficulty would be solved, you may depend upon it, with sufficient ease, and the popular mind would suffer no long suspense. Men would of course say,—If eternity is not infinite, it is finite. Nor would such a result be in our opinion less valid as logic, than it would be as plain common sense. Your very denial of endlessness is an appeal to our notions of time: but if you appeal to our notions of time, and reject time infinite, as applied to eternity, there can only remain time finite.

Let those then who at all doubt the effects of such a doctrine in society, give Mr. Maurice the benefit of their doubt; but it would be doing great injustice to our own convictions, if we owned to any doubt at all on this subject. We can hardly dwell upon the effects of any general spread of such a doctrine, even in simple thought, without alarm. The release from the notion of eternal punishment would be felt by the great mass, as a relief from the sense of moral obligation, and, relying on the certainty that all would be sure to be right at last, men would run the risk of the intermediate punishment, whatever it might be, and plunge into self-indulgence without hesitation. It may be said, that men do this now under the belief in eternal punishments: they do—and there is no limit to the powers of imagination by which men can suppress the reasonable certainty of the future, and make the present everything. But the belief in eternal punishment is the true and rational concomitant of the sense of moral obligation. Destroy the punishment, and you destroy the sin: limit it, and you make sin a light thing. Moreover, the belief in eternal punishment, however suppressed, leaves a blank and dark ultimate prospect before the sinner's mind; but this prospect is removed by the limitation of punishment; and in the place of a cloudy termination of the view, which the sinner at any rate had rather have removed, and which therefore must so far operate as a stimulus to that change of life which alone can remove it, he has a bright

ultimate termination any how, whether he changes his way of life, or whether he does not: and, therefore, he loses a stimulus to change, which even the most careless must in some way feel. For even those, to whom eternal punishment is thus a mere negation and suppressed idea, had rather have a bright termination than this suppressed bad one before them. Conscious of his own religious convictions, and aspirations after holiness for its own sake, Mr. Maurice may not see these consequences involved in his doctrine; but the practical working of it, were it to gain ground, would soon force them upon his observation. A general relaxation of moral ties, a proclamation of liberty and security, the audacity of sins which had before been abashed, carelessness where there had been hesitation, obstinacy where there had been faltering, and defiance where there had been fear, would show a world in which the sanctions of morality and religion had been loosened, and in which vice had lost a controlling power, and got rid of an antagonist and a memento. Whether or not the form and manner of its act could have been improved, the Council of King's College has done a substantial duty to the Church and the nation, in suppressing at once a teaching that immediately interfered with the very foundation of religion and morals. This is not a question of this or that particular doctrine, however important; but it is a question, whether we are to have religion at all amongst us, supported by its proper sanctions, and endowed with its legitimate stimulants and motives. To have stood by and done nothing in such a case as this, would have been a betrayal of their trust, an abandonment of a charge which the Church has committed to them, and for the execution of which they are responsible to that Church. The religious feeling of the country at large would not have allowed such indifference, and just clamour would have compelled them at last to do what their own consciences had neglected.

Meantime, we are not judging Mr. Maurice himself, but only his teaching. We know this teaching has a very different character to his mind, from that which it has to ours; and that he regards himself simply as in possession of a very deep truth of religious philosophy, viz. that eternity is pure existence, or some such truth as that. He disowns these consequences, and pictures to himself all the developments which we have given to his principle, as so much irrelevant alarmist misapprehension. We are glad he does so: we should be sorry to think that he thought all these consequences true. So far as he is personally concerned, we are content to think of his truth exactly in the light in which he regards it, separating it from all the consequences which we have attached to it. But in this case, he will allow

us to say, that it is not without real pain that we see a sincere, zealous, and able man losing his just influence and destroying his usefulness out of deference to a mere subtlety and a crotchet as impalpable as the air. We know immediately he will tell us,—it is not a subtlety, but a vital truth—a truth intimately connected with practice; that he could not live for a day as a Christian without it; and that his whole moral and religious convictions would collapse, if he had not this truth about pure existence—or whatever it may be—supporting him. We know he will maintain the urgent necessity of preaching this great practical truth to peasants and labourers, to ploughmen and artisans, to men, women and children, in towns and villages, in fields and market-places; that he is convinced that these masses of uninformed and imperfect minds are crying out for this especial truth, are hungry and desperate for it, and that woe to him if he does not go forth to satisfy this forlorn, desolate and consuming void within them. We know he will say all this, with the most entire sincerity. But will he take it ill if we remind him, that many men of sincerity, equal to his own, have thought particular truths of great importance at one part of their lives, which they have not at another; and that what once rested on an all-absorbing necessity, has come down to the rank of very secondary, if not very ambiguous truth? In the excitement of philosophical thought, we mistake the proportions of the great scheme of truth; we are led on by a favourite idea which becomes at every moment more necessary, more dominant, more fundamental, till it gains a complete throne and mastery. And such ideas often become stereotyped, and their dominion lasts for some time. But time, experience, fresh reading, new acquaintances, and other things, introduce us to new aspects of truth; the deep lines of a favourite idea wear insensibly away. We become aware that we can do without it: and the large and true foundations of religion take gradual hold of our minds, to the subordination of what was narrow, partial, and fictitious. It is possible that Mr. Maurice may some day not think the deep and subtle truth which he cherishes at present of such overwhelming consequence and weight. He may one day come to reflect, that the great idea of time, with which the Author of nature has endowed us, is, after all, our intended and proper guide to a notion of eternity; and that, however reason may demand its qualification, we shall not gain by endeavouring to get entirely out of its reach, in picturing to ourselves the life beyond the grave. He may come to consider, that in this life we must be content with such helps as are provided for us, in forming our conceptions of spiritual things; and that it is better to have a lower representation of truth, than none at all. If

such thoughts as these should ever at any future day approve themselves to him, we shall rejoice at the recovery of a person to utility and just influence, who could only have lost them by the pardonable causes of a mistaken zeal, and an unmanageable profundity.

We cannot, however, conclude this article without a slight notice of one particular claim put forward by Mr. Maurice in this controversy. For the *truth* of the interpretation of the word 'eternal' which he has put forward, Mr. Maurice appeals to certain grounds of metaphysics, and to Scripture thus metaphysically interpreted; but his *liberty* as a Church of England teacher, to inculcate this doctrine, he rests upon the ground that the formularies of the English Church nowhere condemn that sense of the word 'eternal' which he adopts, or impose that sense of the word which he opposes; that they use the word without marking the particular sense which is to be given to it, and therefore are to be understood as leaving it open to any person to attach this or the other meaning to it as he pleases, and to teach the doctrine of an 'eternal' state of reward and punishment in his own sense of that word.

'I therefore pledged myself implicitly in my Essays, I pledge myself explicitly now, that I will not, God being my helper, give up my liberty as a member of the Church of England by accepting any *new* Formulary on this subject, or *new* explanation of the Formularies which I have accepted. To these I adhere, in what I believe to be their literal natural sense.'—*Letter of Mr. Maurice in Dr. Jelf's Pamphlet*, p. 21.

'The general notion which you encourage—that the King's College Council may demand of its professors an assent to a number of *et cæteras* not included in the Formularies to which, as churchmen and clergymen, they have set their hand—is one for which I own I was not prepared. It will alarm, I believe, many persons who differ very widely with me. I do not see how it can fail to alarm every man who attaches any sacredness to his oaths or his subscriptions.

'On this point I must insist very strongly. I said in a former letter that I accepted the words of our Formularies and of the Scriptures in what seemed to me their literal and simple sense, but that I would accept no new interpretation of them. In noticing this remark, you have availed yourself, of course unintentionally, of the equivocal force of the adjective "new." You say, "I wish for no new Articles nor any new interpretations of our Formularies," meaning that your interpretation is the old one. But I submit that everything is *new* to the subscriber of a Formulary which is not contained in that Formulary at the time he subscribes it, however old or familiar it may be.'—*Mr. Maurice's Answer to Dr. Jelf*, p. 3.

The ground advanced here is a general ground, that whatever the formularies of the Church do not expressly and by word enjoin, is to be considered as open; and that a man is bound by nothing but that which has been *nominatim* and specifically put before him for his assent.

But such a ground, we must say, appears to us obviously untenable, contrary to common sense and common equity, and fatal to any Church that should allow or connive at it. It is obvious that when a Church constructs formularies, and lays down articles of faith, it cannot possibly stop at every word to assign the exact meaning in which it is used. To do so, were it possible, would be to defeat the very object for which alone it could be done,—that, viz. of accuracy and clearness; to bury the whole formulary underneath an accumulation of definition and a load of words, which would simply perplex, harass, and overwhelm any reader. The articles, as they stand now, are not easy reading; but were they constructed on the explanatory principle just mentioned, the case would be desperate—no reader of human powers could extricate himself out of such a labyrinth of language as would surround him: once in, he could never emerge to light again, by any rational clue, but simply by cutting the knot in the Gordian way, and creating a meaning of his own. But in truth such explanation would be impossible. The compilers of formularies could not interpose to explain words which admitted of no explanation; words of which the meaning has been taken for granted in all ages, and to which all mankind have instinctively annexed one and one only idea, and that one which cannot be defined and analysed. How could one possibly expect that when, in the course of constructing the formularies of the English Church, the compilers came across the word 'eternal,' they should affix a parenthesis to explain what the word 'eternal' meant? What had they to say about it? What could it mean but that which all mankind has always supposed it to mean? Nobody wanted an explanation; nobody could give one, if it was wanted; and nobody could understand one if it was given.

But if it is impossible that the Church should stop to explain every word of her formularies as she constructed them, what is the immediate inference from such a state of the case? Clearly that we are bound to something more than the express and specific terms as such,—the pure naked words of such formularies; viz. to the natural, commonly received, established meaning in which such terms were used; the meaning in which the Church has ever understood them, and in which therefore she imposes them. The impossibility of explanation demands as its correlative this attention and deference to those established and received meanings; allowance must be made for insuperable obstacles; and the necessities of the *imponens* turn to obligations in the subscriber. And though in smaller and secondary matters, where no strong intention of the Church can be supposed, and in doubtful matters where its intention cannot be certified to,

every reasonable latitude must be allowed to subscribers, and the authoritativeness of received meanings not be made a minute, frivolous, and burdensome one; in important and vital articles of Christian teaching the established and received meanings of terms must be considered binding. The intention of the Church must be considered to be represented by the meaning which has been always given in the Church to the term; and the subscriber is bound by the intention of the Church.

To say then, as Mr. Maurice does, that because the meaning of the word 'eternal' is not laid down in our formularies, its meaning is to be considered open, and that the most contradictory to the received one is to be allowed, and its inculcation by teachers in the Church not hindered, is to treat the Church in a way which is alike repugnant to common sense and common equity:—to common sense, because the explanation of such words is not to be expected; to common equity, because it is taking unfair advantage of such an absence of explanation. It is to approach the formularies of a Church in a spirit in which the merest lawyer would not approach a legal document, such as a contract or a will. In every document certain received meanings of terms must be taken for granted; nor are men allowed for an instant, in the interpretation of such documents, to assign some ingenious reason why the received sense of any of the terms employed is incorrect, and on that ground refuse to take the term in the received sense. Were such a system of interpretation allowed in secular matters, there would be an end at once to all good faith and stability in the dealings of man and man. And why should we treat the Church with less tenderness than we treat the world? A fair claim has generally been made for some generosity to the Church, as no ordinary bargainer; but this is to deprive her even of rigid justice. It is to approach the formularies of the Church in a temper of ultra-legality; in the way in which a narrow lawyer applies himself to a hostile legal document, which he is determined to reduce to the very lowest and most necessary meaning in which it can be understood, and to get rid of that even if he can. We cannot but wonder that a man of Mr. Maurice's ordinary generosity should have adopted such a ground: that he should approach the formularies of the Church to which he belongs with the determination to defer to nothing but the absolute naked terms to which he cannot deny he has subscribed; and that, if the Church has not laid down expressly a certain meaning of a certain term, to suppose that he has a right to take advantage of the omission, though the whole world knows that the Church, in using the term, had a certain meaning and no other.

On such a system of interpretation as this, there is not the

simplest and plainest article in the creed that might not be explained away. Let us take the very first article in the Apostles' creed—'I believe in God the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth.' Here is expressed the elementary article of religion, that God is the Creator of the world. But a questioner may say, 'What does that term "Maker" or 'Creator mean? the Church does not express in what sense she 'uses this term. I shall therefore take the liberty of under-'standing this term to mean, not creating absolutely, but creating 'out of a certain primary unformed matter. For though I 'grant that the fair sense of the word create is to create out of 'nothing, its sense is still open, because it is not determined 'what *nothing* is. I shall therefore suppose, that by nothing is 'meant primary unformed matter or chaos; and that when the 'Church says that God created the world, or made it out of 'nothing, she leaves it open whether He made it out of nothing 'in the popular sense of the word, or out of nothing in the sense 'of unformed matter. I shall therefore maintain, as consistent 'with this article of the Apostles' creed, the eternity of matter; 'which I do not believe was made by God, but has co-existed 'always with Him.'

Are we trifling with Mr. Maurice and the reader in supposing such an argument? By no means. The specimen of interpretation of language here given is no invention of our own. Plato called all matter τὸ μὴ ὂν, or nothing; the later Platonists confined this term to the primary formless matter of which the world was made; still that which ordinary men would consider *something*, was called by this name. And this disguise of something, under the term 'nothing,' has been carried on by modern philosophers, who were thus enabled, under the outside of an article of the Christian creed, to hold a platonic origin of the world, and to believe in 'God as the maker of heaven and earth,' and the eternity of matter at the same time. We quote from Mosheim:—

'Among modern philosophers, Robert Fludd, and many others, who have admired and endeavoured to propagate Plato's sentiments, have chosen to imitate the fashion of the Platonists, and to call matter nothing; which they seem to do for this reason among others, that it may not be known how far their doctrine respecting the origin of nature differs from that universally received in the Christian Church. For though they make use of Christian expressions in speaking of the commencement of the universe, and like ourselves say that all things were produced out of nothing, yet they do not attach the same meaning as we do to the words, and by the word nothing they only intend a rude and shapeless kind of matter, which they will have to be a second principle of all things. These unfair interpretations have been well exposed among others by Peter

Gassendi, whose words are worth quoting—"As respects creation," says he, "must not be understood a production of something out of nothing, in the same sense as the Mosaic creation of the universe is commonly intended by divines. For though Fludd makes use of both the words and the narrative of Moses, yet he uses all these in a symbolical manner. By the word *creation*, therefore, he understands in the first place the production or generation of anything which is said to be made out of obscurity, or matter, which by him is called nothing."'—*Mosheim's Dissertation, annexed to Cudworth*, c. 5.

One would have thought beforehand that the meaning of the word '*nothing*' was sufficiently clear, and afforded but little room for division of opinion. It is a word which has very decidedly its received and established meaning. Yet here we see another and more recondite sense assigned to the word, and upon the basis of that new signification, a doctrine of creation founded, which introduces, underneath the unchanged language of the Apostles' creed, a pagan deity—a being who divides with primordial matter the empire of the universe. Dualism, Manicheanism, and the basest religions, that strike at the very root of the true doctrine of a God, insinuate themselves upon the strength of a certain meaning of the term *creation*, different from its popular and received meaning. But would such an idea of the Deity be allowed to be taught in our lecture-rooms and pulpits? Or would not the orthodox feeling of the Christian body at once reject it, and maintain the received meaning of the word 'create,' however unexpressed, as one which was supposed by the Church in framing the article, and only not expressed, because no other meaning was contemplated as capable of being held by Christians? And has not the word 'eternal' its thoroughly received and popular sense, as much as the word 'create' has?

Again, the Church has no expressed doctrine on the subject of inspiration. This is a most important and serious subject—the more so, because we cannot introduce it merely as an illustration of a principle, as we did the preceding instance, being quite aware that it is a question which is at this moment exciting deep thought, and which may before long come out in controversial shape. We are not going to discuss it thus incidentally at the end of an article; but we may at the same time be allowed to state what will not be disputed; and that is quite enough for our present purpose as regards the general question of subscription.

The Church implies, then, but makes no explicit assertion of the inspiration of Scripture. It is supposed that Scripture is inspired, because infallibility can only come from inspiration, and Scripture is infallible; any article of belief that can be proved

from or shown to be contained in it, being necessarily true. But because no doctrine of inspiration is formally laid down, is any Church teacher at liberty to maintain any doctrine of inspiration he pleases,—even the most ultra German one, which virtually denies all inspiration? However unexpressed as a doctrine, the belief in the full inspiration of Scripture is one which lies underneath the whole Christian creed, and could not be removed, without bringing the whole creed down with it. Thus Laud speaks:—

'Every rational science requires some principles quite without its own limits, which are not found in that science, but presupposed. Thus rhetoric presupposes grammar, and music arithmetic. Therefore it is most reasonable, that theology should be allowed to have some principles also, which she proves not, but presupposes. . . . .

'The assurance we have of the penmen of the Scriptures, the holy prophets and apostles, is as great as can be had of any human authors of like antiquity. For it is as morally evident to any pagan, that S. Matthew and S. Paul wrote the Gospel and Epistles which bear their names, as that Cicero or Seneca wrote theirs. But that the apostles were divinely inspired while they wrote them, this hath ever been a matter of faith in the Church, and was so even while the apostles themselves lived, and was never a matter of evidence and knowledge, at least as knowledge is opposed to faith. Nor could it at any time then be more demonstratively proved than now. . . . . .

'The assent which we yield to this main principle of divinity, "that the Scripture is the word of God," is grounded upon no compelling or demonstrative ratiocination, but relies upon the strength of faith more than any other principle whatsoever. For all other necessary points of divinity may by undeniable discourse be inferred out of Scripture itself once admitted; but this concerning the authority of Scripture not possibly: but must rather be proved by revelation, which is not now to be expected; or presupposed and granted as manifest in itself, like the principle of natural knowledge; or by tradition of the Church both former and present, with all other rational helps, preceding or accompanying the internal light in Scripture itself.'—*Laud's Conference with Fisher* (*Anglo-Catholic Library*), p. 118, *et seq.*

It is evident, then, that there is *a* doctrine or idea of inspiration, which, however unexpressed, is a true and a most vital part of our creed, and to which subscription is implied, when the formularies of the Church are subscribed to. And a test of there being such an idea is this, that contradiction to it could certainly not be formally and authoritatively allowed, without creating such scandal as would issue either in a withdrawal of the liberty, or a disruption of the Church—such a disruption as would show quite plainly that the Church at large has a belief on this subject, which it thinks essential.

On the whole, it is abundantly clear to us that no religious communion that had a definite creed at all, could hold together upon such a principle of subscription as that which Mr. Maurice,

in his inference from the absence in our Articles of any particular interpretation of the word 'eternal,' has put forward. All human society requires for its maintenance and necessary order the bond of certain mutual understandings and implicit pledges; and if men begin to think themselves bound by nothing but by ink and paper, by seals and signatures, the cement of the whole fabric is loosened, and the materials part asunder. And religious communion requires the same substratum. No religious body can be kept together by statements and definitions solely: there must be something beyond these in which union is required: you may define and define, but something is left after all which is undefined; and that may be unimportant, and therefore open, or it may be most vital and fundamental, and therefore binding. The sound reason and common sense of the Christian world must ultimately settle which the open and which the binding part of this unexpressed belief is, and the faith of the Church must discern what is necessary to it, and what is not. But some agreement beyond that which statements express, is essential to a Christian body, and must, when the occasion arises, be asserted and imposed on the teachers of that body.

Since writing the above article, a second edition of the Essays has appeared, with a new Preface, and a new concluding chapter on the subject of the word 'Eternal.' The new portion contains no argument which had not appeared in the old, and leaves the controversy where it was. We will only notice two points.

Dr. Jelf has in his Letter accounted, in a way which we think quite satisfactory, for the omission in the Articles of 1562, of the xliid. of the Articles of 1552, against those who deny the eternity of future punishments. It appears that this was one of a set of erroneous opinions held by the sect of Anabaptists, which in 1552 was of sufficient importance to make such special notice of its errors expedient, but in 1562 had sunk into insignificance; in consequence of which such notice was no longer expedient. Mr. Maurice, in the new concluding chapter, admits the reasonableness of this explanation, but draws from it the opposite inference to that which Dr. Jelf has drawn, and that which, we think, most people would draw. Dr. Jelf naturally gathers from the explanation, that the omission of the article is a proof only of the altered condition of the Anabaptists, and not of an altered belief on the question itself. Mr. Maurice gathers from it that the compilers of the Articles had changed their minds from thinking it necessary to impose a certain opinion on this subject, to thinking the subject an open one. 'Here is an omission,' he says, 'a carefully considered omission

'in a document for future times, of that which had been too 'hastily admitted to meet an emergency of that time. The 'omission was made by persons who were probably strong in 'the belief that the punishment of wicked men is endless, but 'who did not dare to enforce that opinion upon others.' (P. 461.) The former appears to us the inference which common sense suggests. The latter inference is in the teeth of the facts of the case, which point to the decay of the sect exclusively, and to no change in the minds of the compilers of our Articles, as the reason of the omission. It would, if true, moreover, carry along with it the inference that the doctrine of the resurrection from the dead is considered by the Church an open one; the article on the resurrection and that on eternity having been inserted and omitted under exactly the same circumstances.

The second point we notice only for the sake of drawing a very obvious distinction. Mr. Maurice has, both in the old and the new portion of the Essays, but more pointedly in the new, condemned the philosophy of Locke, as a materialist philosophy. We extracted in our article a description from Locke of the idea of infinity. We beg to say here, that we extracted it simply as appearing to us a true, forcible, and copious description of that idea, and not *because* it was Locke's description of it. So long as any philosopher restricts himself to describing faithfully any idea in, or any part of, our minds, we may make use of his assistance without committing ourselves to any general reliance on his system. Such an extract does not entail upon us, then, any share of the controversy respecting the philosophy of Locke, though we may be permitted to say that we think the judgment upon him as simply a 'materialist,' a harsh one.

NOTICES.

We think it was Mr. Wilson Evans' Scripture Biography which set the fashion of making S. Mark the Evangelist the same as John Mark of the Acts. Mr. Evans has treated their supposed identity in a pretty and sentimental tone: Mr. Ruskin more recently has made it the subject of an ingenious symbolical theory. We observe that Mr. Purchas, in his 'Book of Feasts,' (Masters,) a collection of Sermons on the Saints' Days, adopts this view, apparently unconscious that the great balance of evidence and authority is in favour of the existence of two Marks. At any rate, the matter is so doubtful, that we think no homily on S. Mark's day should be primarily employed on a subject so questionable as 'the Saint's fall,' &c. Apart from this blemish, we think Mr. Purchas' volume a creditable one; though the several series by Mr. Paget, Bishop Armstrong, Dr. Newman, and others, might be considered a sufficient recent contribution to this particular subject.

Mr. Isaac Williams's 'Set of Fifty-eight Sermons for the Sundays, and a few Festivals of the Year,' (Rivingtons,) will probably exceed in popularity all this respected writer's previous and very popular works. The sermons are neatness and simplicity itself. They aim each at a single lesson, and a single thought, always the leading idea of the services of the day. They are short, condensed, pointed, plain, and practical:—can sermons have stronger recommendations? It is said—of course we do not vouch for the fact—that many of our Clergy do not compose their own sermons. Far are we from recommending what the world is pleased to call the idle practice of borrowing sermons; but the parish will have little to complain of which for a year gets this sort and cycle of instruction.

'Landmarks of History:—Middle Ages,' (Mozley,) is a worthy supplement to the writer's 'Kings of England.' The two volumes deserve to be what they are fast becoming, text-books in our schools. Their accuracy, completeness, and condensed form deserve all praise: while an occasional glimpse of character-drawing, bright but transient, reveals higher powers in the writer, for which we trust that a larger canvass and single subject may be in reserve.

Mr. Comper's 'Lectures on the Church,' (Lendrum,) we consider one of the few good fruits of the Papal Aggression fury. The author, the incumbent of Nairn, made, or availed himself of, the occasion to put together for the benefit, not only of his own flock, but of his presbyterian neighbours, a syllabus on the distinctive doctrines of the Scottish Church. The result

is a manual, complete, compact, and serviceable, not only for its own immediate purpose, but wherever a temperate and concise vindication of Church principles is required.

'Short Sermons at the Celebration of the Lord's Supper,' (Deighton,) is one of the many proofs which their author, Mr. Harvey Goodwin, affords of his desire, and we understand a successful desire, to do something for the younger members of the University. We do not say that Mr. Goodwin always, perhaps ever, rises to the full conception of the eucharistical mystery: but his pleading for weekly communion and his general earnestness are in the right direction.

We really wish that we could honestly and honourably recommend a 'Companion to Confession, and a Companion to Holy Communion,' by a Layman, (Lumley.) We are quite aware of the needs of our Church in this direction, nor are we disposed to question the loyalty of one who has evidently given much study, and expended much thought and earnestness on this compilation; nor are we disposed to say that even in its present form this manual does not contain much that is profitable and edifying. The devotions are taken from the Sarum Enchiridion, or Manual of Private Devotions, *i.e.* from the unreformed old English offices. The result is, that in the office for Confession, the priest is recommended to absolve his penitents in this form:—'I, by the authority of the same God and Lord 'Jesus Christ, and of the blessed apostles Peter and Paul, committed to me, 'absolve thee, &c.' (P. 22.) Under these circumstances, it would be entirely superfluous to specify our objections to the use of this volume. We think it simply impossible to recommend it with an honest recognition of the Prayer Book of our Church as it is. And, which is the least important aspect of the matter, we must say that in this, as in a previous work, the writer's taste for translating into the most literal English the old offices, produces a dialect which we prefer rather to give a specimen of than to characterise. 'O Holy Christ! enthroned in Heaven, Melody of Regal Glory, before 'Whom ever standeth for Thy Divinity praising Thee, the Dignity of 'Angels, have mercy!'—P. 107.

We welcome a series now publishing under the general title, 'Readings for the Sundays and Holy Days of the Christian Year,' (Whitaker.) The tracts for Advent and Christmas are before us. The plan is simple enough, and its use is in its simplicity; an extract, practical, doctrinal, or explanatory, from a recognised English writer, is attached to each Lesson, Epistle, and Gospel. The selection is made with judgment, and always with a practical aim, and with eminent carefulness to make edification more prominent than curious research. A tessellated, and occasionally jarring effect is produced by the difference in style and language of the writers who succeed each other. Such a result is of course unavoidable, when the extracts range from Sandys to Heber; but this fault may be excused for a more than counterbalancing harmony in result.

The same publisher assures us that his 'Church Hymnal' has been 'submitted to various tests,' and that 'communications on it have been

received from a very large number of clergymen.' The value of these facts we are unable to appreciate; because, to submit a thing to a test is no proof that it bears it well, nor can we understand what is asserted in favour of a book, from the circumstance that a great many persons have written letters about it. For ourselves, we may say that the 'Church Hymnal' by no means fulfils our idea of what its ambitious title claims.

'The Autobiography of a Five-Pound Note,' (Clarke,) is the first of a series of cheap books for Railway Reading, planned with a good purpose, to 'combine with sound principles, taste, sprightliness, humour, and command of diction.' What the authoress possesses in the first qualification, we are disposed to give her all credit for; but in the other requisites which she specifies, we are bound to say that her aspirations at present exceed her acquisitions. A duller volume we never had the ill luck to stumble over.

Another complete volume of the 'Magazine for the Young,' (Mozley,) reminds us to congratulate the compilers of the best, cheapest, and we hope most successful, of these Church pioneers, on the steady growth of a periodical, the labours concerned in which can only be understood by those experienced in the responsibilities of this kind of literature.

'Passages from Missionary Life,' by Archdeacon Merriman, (Bell.) Unaffected in style, full in matter, and most interesting in details; we should say that no better antidote than this work exists, to the coarse slanders of a recent writer in one of our quarterly contemporaries, who suggested that our Colonial Bishops spent most of their time in lounging in England. On the whole, perhaps, a walk of five hundred miles through a South African desert and bush, with scant fare and no lodging,—Bishop Gray's daily life,—is one way of doing the Church's work, and has its value. To libel all shades of religious earnestness, from the calm solitude of a South Devonshire Vicarage, or the voluptuous ease of the Baths of Lucca, is another.

Bonnechose's 'History of France' (Routledge) fills up a blank in our ordinary text-books. It fills it up not only with completeness, but elegance.

We may excuse the affected title of 'Work: Plenty to do, and how to do it,' (Cradock,) and we may pass over points of disagreement both as regards the subjects, and the way in which they are treated, for the evident signs of earnestness which it displays.

Dr.—now Bishop—'Colenso's Village Sermons,' (Bell,) attracted a good deal of adverse and unnecessary criticism on their appearance; not so much, we are bound to think, upon the strength of expressions, of which one at least struck us as hasty, as because the writer, with more chivalry than discretion, dedicated them to Mr. F. Maurice. On the eve of his consecration, Dr. Colenso published a letter to the Primate in vindication, which, indeed, was not wanted, of his full acceptance of the doctrines of the Gospel. The Archbishop gracefully enough expressed his complete acquiescence in Dr. Colenso's defence, at the same time administering, not before it was wanted, a significant snubbing to the *Record*.

We have to announce the completion of two valuable serials. 1. 'Sermons for the Christian Seasons,' (J. H. Parker,) of which the enterprising publisher projects a second series; and 2. Mr. Wm. Jackson's 'Stories and Catechisings on the Collects,' (Mozley.) These collections, and we may say the same of Mr. Parker's 'Plain Commentary on the Gospel of S. Matthew,' have already gained so firm a hold on general confidence, that we think not so much of attracting, as of continuing, attention to them.

We are glad to welcome a new and vigorous contemporary, in the 'South African Church Magazine,' (Capetown: Robertson.) It is a sign of growth in the promising Church and Mission of the Cape, of no slight significance.

Mr. Matthew Arnold's 'Poems' (Longman) we propose to submit to a longer examination than would find its place in this department. Of other poetry we acknowledge, 1. 'The Hero's Child,' by Miss, or Mrs., Debenham, (Hughes.) 2. 'Poems,' by James Payn, (Macmillan.) 3. Salem Redeemed,' by Mr. Edmund Peel. One characteristic, we fear the predominant one, of recent verse, pervades all these volumes; they are utterly unreadable.

'Doctrine de l'Eglise Anglicane sur les Sacraments, &c.' (J. H. Parker,) is, we believe, Mr. Meyrick's excellent idea. A short tract, embodying the Catholic doctrine of the Church of England on Orders, Sacraments, and Sacramentals. It is designed for distribution by foreign travellers: and perhaps its circulation would tend to dissipate the unhappy misconceptions of the English Church, to which the proceedings of Miss Cunninghame and her friends so frequently give occasion.

Mr. Boone has sustained—or shall we say revived?—an old reputation, in his recent 'Volume of Sermons,' (J. W. Parker.) They are specimens of a school of homiletics which has not been lately in favour: but which has its specialties of value. In style Mr. Boone is elaborate and careful, artificial perhaps; but his Sermons are distinct compositions throughout, and modelled on a plan and with an object intellectually fixed and followed. We thought the Appendix on Modern Unbelief unequal to the promise which its subject held out.

Murray's 'Railway Reading' keeps up its character for variety and interest. Of its two recent publications, a grim and ghastly Monograph of 'The Guillotine,' by Mr. Croker, is hardly a Christmas book: but it is replete with curious information. It settles what, indeed, had long ceased to be a moot point—the antiquity of the machine: and it dispels the legend of poetical as well as distributive justice, which made Guillotine Perillus like the victim of his own ingenuity in engines of death. The 'Beauties of Byron in Prose and Verse,'—the principle of selection adopted, might, if the subject were worth it, attract criticism,—is the last number which has been forwarded to us.

Mr. J. C. Robertson's 'History of the Christian Church' (Murray) reaches us too late in the quarter to permit us to do more than express a prejudice, produced by a very cursory perusal, in its favour.

Of Mr. Cowie's 'Hulsean Lectures' (Rivingtons) we may say exactly the same: the preacher's high and well-deserved reputation predisposes us in their favour.

'Hints on Clerical Reading,' by Mr. John Jebb, (Batty,) is from the pen of one who has earned a right to speak on the subject. Appended, we find some remarks by the editor of a weekly newspaper, in which Mr. Jebb printed his advice. This writer does not display evidence of the same qualifications: he tells us that the article 'the' ought to be pronounced 'thuh' before a consonant.

'Conversations on the Choral Service,' (Harrison,) is a reprint of some early papers which were published in the 'Parish Choir.' They form an admirable and available armory of answers to objectors. Among testimonies we wonder that the compiler has not fallen in with that striking anonymous work published some twenty years ago, 'Apology for Cathedral Service:' the author of which is quite unknown—at least to us.

Having said something recently on the subject of Church Penitentiaries, we cannot do better than extract, by way of Christmas memorandum of our duties, the conclusion of a recent tract by Mr. Carter of Clewer, in which he summarily gives an outline of what is now doing:—

'As the principles and objects of the House of Mercy may not be known 'to all whom this appeal may reach, the following details are added, to 'show briefly the main differences which distinguish it from the Peniten-'tiaries hitherto established for the reformation of fallen women.

'1. The work is carried on by a body of Sisters, devoting themselves to 'it as a religious service, for Christ's sake, and from love of souls. The 'Sisters dwell in the same house with the penitents, and are engaged con-'tinually in instructing, training, and watching over them, whether in their 'employments, or in recreation, or at meals, and by night equally as 'by day.

'All possible care has been taken to preserve the doctrine and discipline 'of the Church of England by vesting the charge of all spiritual matters in 'clergymen, who, together with the Sisters, are responsible to the Bishop 'of the Diocese, as Visitor.

'Provision has also been made for the better maintenance and stability 'of the House, by associating together a select body of benefactors, as a 'Council, to aid the Sisterhood from without, and who have undertaken, 'together with other duties, the care of the property and regulation of the 'expenditure.

'2. The period of the penitents' remaining in the house is not fixed. Each 'case depends on its own circumstances; but the average period is from a 'year and a half to two years; the principle acted upon being that all o' 'whose restoration there is reasonable hope, be permitted to remain til 'they seem fitted to bear the trials and temptations of the world.

'3. Penitents who continue to conduct themselves well, are encouraged to 'regard the House of Mercy as their home, where even after their return to 'the world, they may, in case of difficulty, still look for sympathy and aid.

'When it is considered how large a proportion of the inmates of Penitentiaries are orphans or homeless, how many from physical weakness, or other incapacity, are wholly unfitted for ordinary service, and how imminent the danger of relapse to former sin must under such circumstances often be, the importance of having such a refuge in case of pressing need, is evident.

'4. The Chapel of the House of Mercy is private; the Sisters, and the penitents under their care, forming the entire congregation, with the exception of such friends as may occasionally join them in their devotions.

'5. The House of Mercy is situated in the country; gardens and fields adjoin the house, affording facility not only for healthful recreation, but for such employments as gardening, the care of animals, dairy work, &c. &c.

'The experience now of about four years has more and more strengthened our conviction, that the mode of dealing, above sketched out, is the only effectual one to meet the exigencies of the case. It may seem to be setting in motion an over-large array of means for the relief of so despised and outcast a class. But it is impossible, without much experience, to conceive the thoroughly darkened and disordered state of soul which is superinduced by the long, long neglect, or unbridled indulgence of years. And the call is the more deeply touching, because, in the vast majority of cases, such a state arises not from any wilful choice of sin, but from a tangled tissue of predisposing causes deserving far more of pity than of reprobation. Fearfully exposed is the present state of our poor, and intensely active the snares which are ever around them for their destruction. The very weakness in which God has formed woman, the better to win man's loving care, and the trustfulness and dependence which were intended to excite high honour and zeal for her protection, become, by a train of unnatural circumstances, the fatal openings for her ruin and degradation. Themselves deceived, they become thenceforth the reckless deceivers of others; the tempted, by a righteous law of retribution, become the tempters in their turn; a great multitude, ever increasing, because, after the final step, there is no possibility of return; despair, hunger and scorn forcing each one to become the centre of ever-spreading pollution. What a sad and shameful scene London presents, as the gloom of night comes down upon her streets! As constantly as each morning pours forth the streams of life peopling the vast city by day, so evening after evening, from each hiding-place of shame, issues forth a fresh population, re-peopling and possessing every haunt, and meeting all who must needs still leave their homes, at every turn. In the rescue of but one such lost soul, what an amount of misery and sin is spared, and what blessing is shed not only within herself, but among all connected, or to be connected, with her, the Day of Judgment alone can reveal. And surely among the most tender passages of the blessed Gospel there are none more touching than those in which our Lord charges us to win and receive back fallen woman, as if her utter hopelessness were the most potent plea, her weakness the irresistible claim on all hearts, even as her fall is the most destructive source of unholiness and

'woe to family, as well as individual life; the surest hindrance to His work 'of redemption.

'The more deeply ruinous the fall, the wider its baneful effects, the more 'is every means and appliance urgently required for the recovery. There is no 'difficulty in gathering in almost any number of these fallen ones, desiring, 'yea, yearning to be restored; the real difficulty, and one which the Church 'ought surely to meet at any cost, is to provide homes wherein the surest 'and amplest means of restoration can be supplied. What is done should 'be done in the most effectual way, lest much labour be spent in vain. 'Therefore would we do our best for these lost souls, even as our Lord 'spared not His very life for ourselves; and would shed around them a new 'atmosphere of purity, of love, and unceasing ministrations of the Word of 'God, of sacraments, and prayers, if by any means, through the grace of 'God, we may save some. And now in the confidence of growing expe-'rience, and with every cause for thankfulness in our present progress, we 'urge this appeal, and we trust that it will not seem a great thing to press 'earnestly for money, while we see daily before us those who are offering 'not money only, but all earthly prospects, yea, and their own selves 'also, for love of Him Who came to seek and to save the lost sheep of His 'fold.'

It is satisfactory to be able to announce that besides these Houses of Refuge already open, and full to overflowing in London, it is proposed to establish a large institution, combining another House of Immediate Reception, and a Home or House of Penitence after the Clewer type.

A 'Prospectus' has reached us of a work which has occupied a diligent and laborious clergyman, Mr. Wells Whitford, for many years, 'A Greek Concordance to the Holy Bible,' (J. W. Parker.) The author thus describes it:—

'The principle is simply that adopted in all other Indexes of words or 'phrases: first, an alphabetical succession of *all words* occurring in the 'Sacred Text, (in which point, also, this work differs from all former 'Scripture Concordances,) a grammatical succession of each one of their '*inflections*, with a classified arrangement of the *second* and *third* words, or '*more*, (if found in phrases together more than *twice*,) with the *main* word; 'and, secondly, the reference—which in no instance is omitted—made, not 'at the *beginning* of each line, but, as in every other Index, at the *end* of 'every passage.

'The result, not less surprising than important, is that, while increased, 'it is believed, materially, in utility, it will be, notwithstanding, so reduced 'in bulk, as to compress the essence, undiluted, of three cumbrous folios, 'into one moderate imperial octavo volume, at a price (to place it within 'reach of Students in Theology) the lowest possible.'

From all that we can learn, the assistance of those engaged in sacred studies would be well bestowed in aiding this important publication.

A simple and effective Tract on Cholera, for parish distribution,—how to avoid it,—has been printed by Mr. J. H. Parker. It condenses the marrow

of direct information on the subject: and a good-sized packet may be had at a trifling price.

We have received the little work, 'Rosaries: compiled for the use of English Churchmen,' with a new publisher's name. An extract from one of our own articles is ostentatiously recalled to our recollection, which we presume the writer of the preface thinks inconsistent with any strictures we may have passed on his work. On this we have to remark—1. That one, and that not an immaterial, word in the quotation from our pages is altered: we said, 'our petitions may *often* be better suited,' &c. The present writer changes this into 'may *after all* be better suited.' 2. Our article states that the *principle* of the Rosary may be so and so defended. What we object to in the compiler of the manual, 'Rosaries,' is, not that he applies the principle of rosaries, but asks us to use the very thing itself; *ex. grat.* the Devotions to the Sacred Heart. These, he suggests, should be used in our churches. Now, one of two things is certain: either that the compiler of this work knows the general, popular, and practical effects of the Devotions to the Sacred Heart, and how it becomes—say in a whole country, like Spain—a substitute, or occasional substitute, for what we venture to think are the reasonable, edifying, and ancient prayers of the Church; or, he knows nothing about the practical effects of this particular *cultus*. If, like ourselves, the present writer is familiar with its consequences, we desire no controversy with him; a person who, with his eyes open, asks to introduce such a devotion among ourselves, we shall not dispute with. But if he has only a literary acquaintance with the matter, we must say that he ought to have paused before he committed this work to the press.

'A Clergyman's Scriptural Reasons for not co-operating with the Bible Society; in a Letter to Lord Shaftesbury,' (Masters,) is an ingenious argument, fairly put.

Blackader's 'English Bible, divided into Paragraphs, with Maps and Notes,' is very far in advance of those miserable Family Bibles, with heretical commentaries, which used to be hawked about in serial instalments, and too often formed the tradesman's and cottager's divinity library. As far as we have examined this publication, which is very neat, the notes are really illustrative, and seldom offensive. In tone, it generally reflects Dr. Kitto's publications.

'Sir Ælfric,' (Whitaker,) is a well-meaning collection of tales and allegories. One of them thus commences:—'I was lying by the side of a pretty little stream, that ran out of a broad, open river.' This, of course, was in fairy land; for in this nether world, ruled by the laws of gravitation, 'pretty little streams' run into, not out of, 'broad open rivers.'

It is with extreme pain that we ask attention to a 'Statement and Correspondence between the Lord Primate of Ireland, and the Rev. George Williams,' (J. W. Parker,) which reaches us at the last moment before publication. Public opinion has expressed itself with sufficient distinctness on the Circular of the Four Archbishops; from the majority of their

Graces, we fear that an attempt to claim a more than synodical authority, and to interfere with the just exercise and expression of opinion on the part of the Clergy, is not inconsistent. But that the Archbishop of Armagh should have permitted himself to be made use of in this matter, is a subject of sincere regret to all who have valued his Grace's liberality. In the correspondence with Mr. Williams, there is the exhibition of a temper and tone which is painful to have to characterize. We therefore decline the task. Amidst this distress, the extreme folly of one Mr. Green furnishes a ludicrous element, in a transaction in which, apart from Mr. Williams's share in it, it would be hard to discover any redeeming feature. Meanwhile, let us not forget what is the original point in dispute; whether a pledge and bargain made in the name of England shall, or shall not, be kept. We are thankful to Lord Shaftesbury for some manful sincerity in this matter. He said distinctly at Islington, that if the bargain and promise was made, it ought to be broken for Gospel purposes.

We cannot permit the present Number of the *Christian Remembrancer* to reach our subscribers without recording our sympathies with that grief which we are certain must possess them, in common with the whole Church, at the intelligence of the removal of Dr. Mill, Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Cambridge. Living long enough for fame, Dr. Mill has been taken away when his faithfulness and services could be least spared. He carries with him more, and more enduring, than literary honours. Severe to himself, and of a simplicity of manners which well recalled the scholars of other days, Dr. Mill possessed to a singular degree the art of winning confidence. He was, if any, a guileless man: of strong and ardent affections, and, possessed with burning sympathies, in what seemed reserve of manner, he was only checking a natural activity or even vehemence of character. Though far advanced in acquirements above our sciolism, he was most free and courteous in communicating, even to strangers, from the exuberance of his learning. He could afford to disdain compromise, whose whole life exhibited a perfect consistency in teaching. He was one of whose steadfast loyalty to the Church none ever ventured to entertain a suspicion: and that Church which he defended with his learning, advanced by his practical works, and illustrated by his life, loses one who will, however, take his permanent station in her list of great theologians. Dr. Mill's mind was eminently scholarly and theological: his very diction, under which ran a deep current of rich but subdued eloquence, showed a systematic and disciplined intellect; and his great, though fragmentary, works on the Pantheistic theory, will be alone a sufficient vindication of his fame. For ourselves, some tribute to the memory of the deceased will not be out of place, for, often as we consulted him, we never asked for information in vain. It is some melancholy satisaction to ourselves to recall, that, full as he was of works, he was always ready and willing to assist others; and to the readers of the *Christian Remembrancer* it is right to say this, recalling the circumstance, that our very last Number was enriched by a contribution from Dr. Mill's learning and kindness.

THE

CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

APRIL, 1854.

ART. I.—1. *The Ethiopic Didascalia; or, the Ethiopic Version of the Apostolical Constitutions, received in the Church of Abyssinia. With an English Translation. Edited and translated by* THOMAS PELL PLATT, Esq., F.A.S. London, printed for the Oriental Translation Fund, 1834.

2. *The Apostolical Constitutions; or, the Canons of the Apostles, in Coptic, with an English Translation by* HENRY TATTAM, LL.D., D.D., F.R.S., &c. Printed for the Oriental Translation Fund, 1848.

3. *Geschichte des Kirchenrechts. Von* JOHANN WILHELM BICKELL. Giessen, 1843.

IN these volumes are first printed some of those documents for want of which the investigations of theologians into the history of the 'Apostolical Constitutions' were brought to a stand, about one hundred and fifty years ago. The divines of that day had pushed their inquiries in the right direction; but they wanted materials for further progress; and the illness and death of Grabe, the chief labourer in that field, brought it to a close. His last tract on this question was curtailed, owing to repeated attacks of acute disease; he had not the strength to print parts of the Arabic Constitutions which he had prepared, and he was waiting for a copy of a Syriac version from Rome. A Greek Vienna MS., of which he had had a copy made, from which he and others cited largely, and which he designed to publish, has now been printed by Bickell; another of his transcripts, from an Oxford MS., was published by Fabricius, amongst the works of Hippolytus; of the Æthiopic Version, of which a portion has been printed by Mr. Platt, he had only the table of contents; of the Syriac, only some extracts in Ecchellensis; of the Coptic, which has been printed by Dr. Tattam, he knew nothing.

Opportunities are now, therefore, given for resuming the investigation of the subject, with the aid of these new materials, to which it is to be hoped that others may be added by the

publication of Syriac and Arabic Versions. We are in a condition to inquire what light is thereby thrown upon the composition, the authority, or historical value of this curious collection.

The Apostolical Constitutions, in eight books, as we have them, occupying a very large space in the opening volumes of collections of Councils, of the Apostolical Fathers, and Pandects of Canons, claim for themselves a very high authority, as also a very high antiquity; they profess to be the composition of the Apostles themselves, their appointments addressed to the Bishops of the Churches, written by the hand of S. Clement of Rome, and laying down rules for the conduct and regulation of the Church in a great variety of points.

If they, as a whole, or if any portions of them, could be shown to have a claim to so supreme an authority, we need not say what deference they would require from the Christian world. It is true indeed that, even in this case, the rules contained in them would not necessarily be obligatory upon us, because the disciplinary injunctions even of Apostles themselves had reference to the special circumstances of their own age; but even considered in an historical point of view only, they would give us an insight into the very innermost life of the Christian Church in the first ages, and would reveal (what we should most desire to know) how Apostles lived, and prayed, and regulated the Church of Christ. And even if we give up this fond and extravagant dream, still, if we could regard these Constitutions, or any portions of them, or any extant documents cognate to them, as genuine and faithful monuments of the really authoritative rules of the first centuries of the Christian Church, they would acquire a great value as a picture of Christian life, and faith, and worship. What their genuine form is, and what their historical authority, it will be our present business to investigate. For it is manifest at once that these two questions are quite distinct. It is one thing to take the text of these documents, and to tracé out its consarcinations, interpolations, retrenchments; to ascertain, if it may be, what it was in its earliest form, what the age and history of its several parts, and so to arrive at the very primary documents themselves, as they first existed, and as they were current in the early ages: it is another and a completely distinct matter to determine of what weight or value these documents are when thus brought into their primitive form. It is one thing to determine the text or age of a work; another, and quite a distinct thing to settle its authority. It by no means follows from the fact that a composition professing to contain Church rules was written in the second or third century, that it is an authentic document; that it is what it professes to be; that it really is

the body of rules by which the Church, or any part of the Church, was then governed. It may have been a private composition, or a work of fiction, or written by those who were not members of the Catholic Church at all. There were in the early ages numberless compositions of this kind — spurious Gospels, spurious Acts of Apostles, spurious letters and lives, which do not seem by any means to have been written with ill intention, nor in all cases, certainly, by those who were alien from the Church. These works were often the inventions of men of lively imagination, who thought to promote piety by works of fiction, and made Apostles and Saints give good instructions and set good examples, which were in truth the fruit of the writers' own lively fancy. The second century had its works of fiction in religious literature in a form of its own, as well as the middle ages or the present day. But even thus, it is well to inquire whether incidentally and indirectly such productions may not have a considerable value, considered historically, as indications of what were then received practices of early ages, taken in connexion with what we learn from other sources.

That we have in the eight books of the Apostolical Constitutions a genuine work of S. Clement and the Apostles, is, we repeat, too gross a conception to have had many advocates. It is true that the editors who first translated them into Latin, Bovius, in 1563, and afterwards Turrianus, with a very uncritical love for the subject of their labours, maintained that they were genuine; and controversialists at that time and afterwards, as they had occasion, have at times alleged them as apostolical; whilst the notion that, in substance and in part, at least, they might be so, was not unusually entertained. Still, great theologians decidedly repudiated them. Baronius, Bellarmine, Petavius, all saw, as it was very difficult not to see, that they were spurious, and interpolated, and even, it might be, heretical. Indeed, the fiction is so clumsily managed as to strike one at the very first. Apostles are brought together who never could have been together in this life; S. James the greater (after he was beheaded), is made to sit in council with S. Paul[1] (though elsewhere he is spoken of as dead).[2] Thus assembled, they condemn heresies and heretics, by name, who did not arise till after their death;[3] they appoint the observance of the days of their death;[4] nay, once they are even made to say, 'These are the names of the Bishops whom we ordained in our life-time.'[5] It is plain that these were sufficiently obvious reasons for the rejection of the Constitutions, at least as they were then extant.

[1] Lib. vi. c. 14. [2] Lib. v. c. 7. [3] Lib. vi. c. 8.
[4] Lib. viii. c. 33. [5] Lib. vii. c. 47.

from the number of Apostolical compositions. For the purposes of controversy, indeed, they afforded little aid to the defenders of the Roman system, and supplied strong arguments against the primitive character of some, at least, of their chief doctrines. In the Constitutions the Church of Rome is nothing more than the Church of Rome. Not a shadow of indication is there of her Bishop, or of any other Bishop, even metropolitan or patriarch, possessing superiority over his fellow-Bishop. Rome is mentioned in the enumeration of the Bishops whom the Apostles ordained, but there it is placed after Jerusalem, Cæsarea, Antioch, and Alexandria: and we read, 'Linus was ordained by me, Paul, and after the death of Linus, Clement, by me, Peter;' there is no hint of S. Peter's special connexion with Rome. And on the whole,—as the collection represents the practices of Eastern Churches, so far as it represents those of any Churches,—the peculiar rules and practices of the Latin Church are contradicted by it.

However, we need not suppose the Roman controversialists to have been influenced by such motives in rejecting these books. There was sufficient to account for their doing so in the books themselves. It was in one who was opposed to the whole ancient discipline of the Church that the Constitutions found their most determined and systematic opponent—in Daillé, the most deeply read in patristic literature, and the most clear and vigorous of the reformed writers at the middle of the sixteenth century. In the work entitled, 'De Pseudepigraphis Apostolicis,' the author undertakes to show that the Constitutions, and also the Apostolical Canons, were not the work of the Apostles, nor of the Apostolic age, as it was easy to do: but he uses many bad arguments, as well as good, and he attempts to prove too much. His indiscriminate condemnation of Canons and Constitutions alike, and the late date to which he would bring down the collection of the former, laid him open to the correction of our more sober English divines Beveridge and Pearson. Bishop Beveridge undertook the vindication of the so-called Apostolical Canons, and established the position—which we consider to be still, in its main points, unshaken, as it has been generally accepted,—that the so-called Apostolical Canons are a collection of Canons of Antenicene Councils, with a few interpolations of later date; that a part of the collection at least was made before the middle of the fourth century, and represents the rules of the Antenicene Church, whilst it is admitted that the collection is incomplete, undigested, and unmethodised.

As respects the Constitutions, which Daillé indiscriminately condemned, Bishop Pearson, with great sagacity, suggested the view which has since been generally accepted, and been made

the basis of all succeeding investigations, and which has received confirmation from every successive discovery of MSS. or versions; viz. that the eight books of the Constitutions are a consarcination—if such a word may be used—a sewing together, of a number of separate documents, which were extant among the Christians of the first four centuries, bearing the names of the Apostles and their immediate disciples; but that in the process of their being put together, as well as before and after, the documents had been interpolated, retrenched, and otherwise altered in various ways.

In the year 1711, William Whiston—learned, indeed, and able, but the most fanciful of theorists—put out the view that these eight books of Apostolical Constitutions, except 'a few gross interpolations of later ages,' are, what they themselves profess to be, the very works of the Apostles themselves, and, as such, 'of Divine origin and authority.' It is scarcely possible to believe that any man could have put together such a series of fancies, and have been perfectly convinced of their truth, if one did not actually read them in his works, and know how tempting it is to build a structure of imagination on the basis of a few, and those perhaps mistaken, facts. With the simplicity of entire conviction, and the vivid depicting of one who had seen what he describes; strangely mixing imagination and fact together; he says that our Saviour himself delivered these Constitutions to the Apostles during the forty days between His resurrection and ascension; that the Apostles met in 'the famous Council of Jerusalem, about the year 64,' (the precision with which he fixes the times and places at which these imaginary events occurred is most curious and ingenious,) 'when the former five books and a half of the Constitutions were written and sent to the Churches;' and again, in a *third* council at Jerusalem, in the year 67 (that recorded in the Acts was the *first*), when St. Paul was with them, they agreed upon the Constitutions in the eighth book, added the seventh, which had been made before, confirmed the whole, and made an extract from them, which was to be published to all (for the eight books themselves were kept concealed in the profoundest mystery of the *disciplina arcani*), under the name of 'The Teaching of the Apostles,' of which (he says) 'we 'have still two Arabick copies in the Bodleian Library at Oxford.' 'The Apostles who survived, together with the remaining kins-'men of Christ, &c.,' held a *fourth* Council at Jerusalem, 'soon 'after its destruction, and made a remarkable addition or appen-'dix, which is now the last part of the sixth book.' The few surviving Apostles, with their companions, held a *fifth* Council, between the years 84 and 88, 'whether at Jerusalem or else-'where is uncertain; wherein the Apostolical Canons were

'drawn up, and some few additions were made to the former 'parts of the whole work.' Besides these Councils at Jerusalem there had been one at Cæsarea, about A.D. 64, 'when the Apostles 'met there to ordain Zacchæus as bishop of that place,' at which the seventh book was first made. It ought to be said that much of this is based on what is mentioned in the Constitutions themselves. But of all this Whiston had the deepest, the most undoubting conviction. To guard us against being misled by extensive learning, and a disposition to speculating and theorizing on such subjects, we will add an extract (and every page of his volume is in the same strain), by which the perversion of his power of estimating the value of evidence may be judged of. He says, with the utmost simplicity, of his Council held A.D. 64, which he calls the Second Council of the Apostles at Jerusalem—

'This Council not meeting till about the time of Luke's writing his Acts of the Apostles, if not rather before it, we cannot expect an account of these, as we have of the *first*. But the Constitutions give us a full and distinct, a certain and authentic account of the Acts, both of the first and of this second Council; and such an one of this second, as shows it to have been the most important Council that ever was held in the Christian Church. Since therein was set down in writing, or engraved in box tables' (all this is his own imagination), 'the Catholic doctrine, or main account of the laws, doctrines and rules of the Gospel, formerly delivered to the Apostles in Mount Sion after our Lord's Resurrection, and now written down or engraved by the hand of Clement himself, as is most probable, (who appears to have been the Apostles' scribe or amanuensis upon this great occasion,) at least, sent by him, principally to the Apostolical Churches, as the grand system of the Christian religion; the main rule both of faith and practice; to be preserved by the bishops in their archives, and transmitted as a sacred *Depositum* to all future generations.'—*Essay on the Apostolical Constitutions*, p. 113.

From our Lord's coming to the Eleven during the forty days after His resurrection, and staying with them so long 'as to 'reveal to them all the Laws and Constitutions of Christianity 'contained in the book before us,' he derives 'a new and most 'powerful argument for the certainty of the fundamental fact 'of Christianity, the resurrection of our blessed Saviour; since 'we see that He did not merely appear suddenly to a few, or to 'many for a few minutes only, but that besides those appearances 'known by all from the Gospel history.' He stayed so long and often with the Apostles as the giving these Constitutions implies. The chronology of S. Paul's life, and the order of time in which the Epistles were written, are determined by Whiston, from the same source; for the Apostolical Constitutions having been shown to be prior to any book of the New Testament, it necessarily followed that all agreements of expression between the two were citations out of, or allusions to, the Constitutions by the writers of the Epistles; not derived into the Consti-

tutions from the Epistles; and according to the number of such citations or allusions, the earlier or later date of each Epistle might, he thinks, be correctly inferred 'upon this reasonable 'hypothesis, that the longer any sacred book had been public, 'and the oftener it had therefore been read in the Churches, and 'at home, the more would it naturally be fixed in the memories of 'Christians, and the oftener quoted by them upon all occasions.' A tabular view of the dates of the Epistles as settled on this principle is given, and the agreements and differences between the arrangement thus resulting, and that of other chronologies is argued out. On the same principle, every correspondence of expression between the Constitutions and the Fathers is alleged as an evidence for their knowledge of this Apostolical book or a citation from it.

The publication of Whiston's book had one good effect; it elicited replies from Grabe[1] and others, which really did contribute to the elucidation of the history of the Constitutions, and materially advanced the true knowledge of the subject. Grabe showed that Whiston's imaginary book of the New Testament, the Teaching of the Apostles, 'of which we have two Arabick copies in the Bodleian Library,' was an Arabic translation of the first five and of part of the sixth book of the Constitutions, corresponding to the contents of the Æthiopic version. He brought out some of those parts which were peculiar to the Arabic; he used all that was then known of a Syriac version, to throw light on the history of the interpolations in the Constitutions, and, which was of most importance, he followed out Pearson's view, and had ready for publication two of the elements out of which, as that great divine and scholar had suggested, the Constitutions which we now have were made up. One of these, the so-called Hippolytean Constitutions, was published from his MS., as we have said, by Fabricius; the other, of which Grabe had a transcript, is now printed by Bickell from the original in the Library at Vienna.

After this, till of late years, almost nothing was done to illustrate the subject. Theologians acquiesced in the view that the Constitutions were an early compilation, in substance Ante-Nicene, but put together, altered, and interpolated to so great an extent, that they could only be cited as corroborative testimony on points of ancient practice.

At this time much interest has been awakened in the subject, and that among a wider circle than students of theology, by the views put out on the subject in the 'Age of Hippolytus;' and

[1] An Essay upon two Arabic Manuscripts of the Bodleian Library, and that ancient book, called the Doctrine of the Apostles, &c., by J. E. Grabe, 1711; and 2d Edition, 1712. Whiston replied in 1711. After Grabe's death Hickes published an account of Dr. Grabe, and of his MSS., 1712; which contains much curious information.

particularly by the beautiful and singularly interesting selection from the Coptic and other collections of Canons, under the names of the 'House Book and Law Book of the Ancient Church.' It is impossible for any one who loves simple Christian truth and holiness, not to be won by the beauty of these extracts; and the thought that by a process of critical discrimination we have here presented to us the very code of rules according to which Christians lived, and Church ordinances were administered, almost in the Apostolic age, is so attractive, so seductive, that one is loth to dispel the imagination, or to suggest that it may be only a dream. As, however, it is most important that we should not be misled on such a subject, and as there is a danger both that exaggerated views of the value and authority of the documents now brought to light may be entertained, as well as, on the other hand, that their importance and real use may be overlooked by the students of ancient Church history, we will endeavour to give such a review of the whole subject as may place at least its main facts within the reach of our readers.

As our researches are independent of those of the author of the 'Age of Hippolytus,' and our line of thought different, we shall pursue the subject without referring further to that work, except very occasionally.

And here, on opening the subject, we must again observe, that there are two distinct questions before us: 1. What is the original form of the Apostolical Constitutions, as a whole or in part, in its text, and its constituent parts? 2. What was the authority of those parts, or the whole, when they were originally written?

It will be more convenient for us first to treat of the second question, so far at least as to see what historical evidence there is for the existence of any such professedly authoritative books of Church Rules; then to examine the history and component parts of the work, from which we shall derive further light as to their true character and value.

And, first, of the historical evidence; it will be observed, from the very nature of the work or works, being anyhow collections of Church Rules, that we might expect to find some notice of them in ecclesiastical writers, if they were received by them as of authority.

The following statement on this point was recently made by one whose name stands high in public estimation as an authority on such subjects:—

'There was a book in the Ante-Nicene Church, in that age which, as a whole, we may call the Apostolic, and of which Hippolytus, Origen, and Cyprian, represent the latter part,—

'there was, among the Christians of those two hundred years, 'a book called Apostolic in an eminent sense, as the work of all 'the Apostles. It was a book more read than any one of the 'writings of the Fathers, and in Church matters of greater 'weight than any other; the book, before the authorities of 'which the bishops themselves bowed, and to which the Churches 'themselves looked up for advice in doubtful cases. And this 'book was not the Bible. It was not even a canonical book, but 'as to its form a work of fiction; and, pretending to have 'emanated from the Apostles, was excluded by most of the 'Fathers as spurious, from the books of the New Testament.'[1]

These statements, indeed, are the exaggerations of an excited imagination, which the author himself probably would, on reflection, very materially qualify. The words, however, express a definite view—they express it with great breadth and clearness—and we therefore select them; not having any controversial view, but because we wish to give to the view itself, so well expressed in them, the most direct contradiction. Let it be observed what the proposition in its simplest elements maintains—that a book containing Ecclesiastical Rules supposed to be derived from the Apostles was extant, was looked up to for advice in doubtful cases, was referred to as of greater weight than any other, and was held to be of supreme authority in the first two centuries of the Church. We affirm that there is no evidence whatever—not a shade of evidence—of the existence of such a book so looked up and referred to.

We are free to admit that rules supposed to be derived, directly or indirectly, mediately or immediately from the Apostles, whether apostolical in their actual origin, or in that they were developments and applications of apostolic institutions, were held to be of absolute authority in the Primitive Church; and were continually referred to, and decided controversies;—*but* they were not reduced to a code or comprised in a book. They were preserved in practice, written in the hearts and memories of Christians, and handed down by continuous tradition. On the other hand, there may have been, many actually were, books professing to contain apostolical appointments; but there is no evidence whatever that they were regarded as of authority, but much evidence the other way. Whatever these writings may have been, they were not authoritative.

We say this without any controversial view to bias our judgment. These supposed early collections of Church Rules, on the whole, tend to confirm our views of Church discipline, practice, worship, and faith. We do not refuse to admit that, whatever their *authority* may be, they may have a value in

[1] Bunsen's Hippolytus and his Age, vol. ii. p. 220.

exhibiting the practices of the early Church, and so is confirming the primitive character of our faith and discipline; but we are bound to remove the impression that in them we have any authoritative collections of the laws of the ancient Church.

It may be sufficient indeed to state, that *there is no reference to such a book, no clear evidence of the existence of such a book, in any author whatever, till the time of Epiphanius,* near the end of the fourth century, and he, while expressing his own view of the authority of the Constitutions, as he had them, distinctly states that they were generally rejected. Now, we would observe that in such a case as that which is now before us, negative evidence is almost decisive; because if there was extant in the primitive Church such an acknowledged collection of ecclesiastical rules, bearing on so wide and varied a range of questions, affecting personal, domestic, ecclesiastical life—the constitution, officers, discipline, worship of the Christians; it is almost impossible that it should not have been continually appealed to, and that some one of the appeals made to it should not have been preserved among the extant remains of the Antenicene Fathers. We have actual records of the differences and difficulties which arose, which that book or books might have determined. Yet of such books, their existence, or their contents, there is not the slightest intimation.

Besides, the very nature of a collection of laws presents a peculiar argument, on the question of its existing as an authoritative document; because a book of laws of disputed authority is not a book of laws at all. It may be an obsolete collection, a book of ancient laws, interesting only in a literary point of view; that is an intelligible supposition, but it requires some proof, that a composition which may have been a work of fiction, and which, be it observed (for such a work is extant), is in its form and composition unequivocally a fiction, is a collection of laws, which was ever, at any time, in force. What we maintain is, that there is no evidence of such a book having at any time been received as authoritative, and that all historical evidence goes to prove the contrary.

If indeed a person was to look cursorily at such a book as Whiston's and to believe his statements, he would suppose that these Constitutions of the Apostles were cited or referred to numberless times, by Father after Father, from S. Clement, the amanuensis who drew them up, without almost any exception, down to the Nicene period; that indeed they were referred to in that period even more than the Bible itself; page after page of his work is filled with citations from the Fathers, which he calls references to the Constitutions, with references to the places of the Constitutions supposed to be cited, in a parallel column, and with his own observations on them; occupying nearly the whole

of an octavo volume of above 700 pages. But what is the fact? why, that not one of these thousands of passages, except those from later writers, refers to the Apostolical Constitutions at all; not one of them assumes the form of a citation, not one of them indicates even the existence of a *book* of such a kind. They consist, *first*, of passages which correspond in expression, more or less, with the Constitutions; but the slightest comparison of the place shows that the expressions are such as any two writers might use, or which the Constitution-maker is quite as likely to have borrowed from the Father, or which, like the two stories of the Phœnix in S. Clement's Epistle and the Constitutions, are of evidently independent origin. In respect of cases of this kind, the same principle of arguing by which the ingenious theorist inferred that a correspondence of expression between the Constitutions and the New Testament proved that the Apostles in writing their Epistles were citing the Constitutions, is equally available in the case of the Fathers; and afforded to Mr. Whiston infallible evidence of the truth of his view. He had, we ought to say, probably one real case of citations from the Constitutions, in the interpolations of S. Ignatius, which he held to be genuine, which are taken from the Constitutions, more probably than the Constitutions from them. Secondly, there are in the Fathers innumerable allusions to the customs of the Church, to the forms of worship, religious ceremonials, pious practices, which the Christians of those times observed; very many of these practices are embodied in the Constitutions; and every instance of this kind of correspondence was regarded by Mr. Whiston as an allusion to his Apostolical book, although there is not in any one instance a shadow of evidence of there being such a book, or indeed any *written* collection of Church customs whatever. The actual practices of the Christians only are noticed. Thirdly, in the case of precepts, moral or religious, for Christians generally, or for any particular class; such as are found, in substance, in every writer on practical religion, which abound in the early Fathers, and with which the Constitutions are replete, being in numberless instances only Scriptural precepts expressed in other terms; every case of such a precept, if found in both, is held to be a reference by the writer to this book. On Whiston's principle, no clergyman could preach a practical sermon, without many unequivocal, though certainly unconscious, citations from this ancient book. Lastly, the Fathers, as is well known, are continually referring to Apostolical tradition, to the preaching, the teaching, the appointments, the orders, the rules of the Apostles, to the Rule of the Church, the Faith of the Church, and the like:— διδασκαλία ἀποστολική: τάξις, διατάξεις, διαταγαὶ, διατάγματα τῶν ἀποστόλων: ἐντολαὶ, προστάγματα, παράδοσις,

παραδόσεις ἀποστολικαί: διατάξεις εὐαγγελικαί: παράδοσις εὐαγγελική, εὐαγγελικὸν κήρυγμα, κήρυγμα τῶν ἀποστόλων, ἐκκλησιαστικὴ διδασκαλία, κανὼν τῆς ἀληθείας, κανὼν τῆς πίστεως, κανὼν τῆς λειτουργίας, νομιμὰ τοῦ δεσπότου, παραγγέλματα, διδαχὴ, διδαχαὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων: every word of this kind, every cognate word, every instance of verb or substantive which refers to evangelical or apostolical teaching, whether that teaching is found written in Holy Scripture or was otherwise delivered to the Church, was set down by Mr. Whiston to be an allusion to the Constitutions.

Since Whiston's time, however, two passages have come to light, belonging to the Antenicene period, which have been supposed to indicate the existence and acknowledged authority of a written collection of apostolical appointments and Church rules, which really belong to the same class as these, but which we will examine more at length. The first is in a fragment of S. Irenæus, first printed by Pfaff in 1715,[1] on the Eucharistic Sacrifice, which begins with the words, 'Those who have 'traced up *the second appointments of the Apostles* (οἱ ταῖς δευτέ-'ραις τῶν ἀποστόλων διατάξεσι παρηκολουθήκοτες), know that 'our Lord instituted a new oblation in the new Dispensation, 'according to the words of the prophet Malachi,' &c. There is, however, no reason to suppose that when the 'appointments of the Apostles' are mentioned here, written documents are referred to. Indeed, the very word παρηκολουθήκοτες implies the contrary; the appointments of which Irenæus is speaking were such as persons became acquainted with, as of apostolical origin, not by reading them in a book, but by investigations, by 'tracing' and 'following' them out. The appointments referred to as the 'second appointments,' seem to be those which the Apostles made after their first and more elementary institutions. The expression contains an obvious reference to the words of S. Paul; when after divers directions to the Corinthian Christians, he says (1 Cor. xi. 34), 'And the rest I will set in order when I come;' the Greek words being, τὰ λοιπὰ, ὡς ἂν ἔλθω, διατάξομαι. They are those after-appointments which gradually became necessary as the Churches grew into form; rules and ordinances of divine service; regulations for the orders and relations of the Christian ministry, for the internal administration of the Churches. The Epistles to Timothy and Titus show the many points in which such appointments were necessary. It was to these after-appointments, which were embodied in the usage of the apostolical Churches, and known to have been of apostolical appoint-

[1] Whiston noticed this fragment, and argued largely on it, in the second edition of his book, 'S. Clement's and S. Irenæus' Vindication of the Apostolical Constitutions,' &c. 1716.

ment, that S. Irenæus appeals in evidence of the institution of the Oblation in the Holy Eucharist by our Lord. It is, however, not impossible that they may have been called 'second appointments,' by way of contrast to those appointments which are contained in the written monuments of the Apostles.

The other passage we referred to, which has been supposed to indicate the existence of such a written record of Church laws, occurs in the work against all Heresies, now attributed to S. Hippolytus. The writer (book ix. c. 11, p. 284) there speaks of Zephyrinus as an 'uneducated, illiterate man, unacquainted with the Church regulations' (*ἄνδρα ἰδιώτην καὶ ἀγράμματον καὶ ἄπειρον τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν ὅρων*). This, however, does not at all show that the rules of the Church were embodied in any written code, but rather the contrary; had they been so written, it would have been an easy matter to have known them; if, on the contrary, they were for the most part unwritten, embodied in practice, and preserved in memory, a man who took little interest in sacred things, of inaccurate mind, and defective in moral apprehension, might easily be ignorant of them. But this part of the subject is sufficiently important to be treated more at length; and a fuller view of it is necessary for appreciating the truth of the whole matter before us.

One of the most remarkable peculiarities of the Christian Dispensation, considered in respect of its documents, is the absence of any formal written code—whether of practical precepts, or of *credenda*, or of ritual, or of Church rules. This peculiarity seems to belong to it as the Dispensation of the Spirit. The moral law, under the new covenant, is 'put into the heart and written in the mind;' the broad outlines are sketched in blessings and woes; or in detached precepts—often apparently exaggerated, or in terms contradictory: they are filled in by exhortations, by warnings, by examples; they find their mutual reconcilement, and are carried out in detail, through the working of the Spirit in the individual soul, and the diffusive judgments of the Christian body. There was no methodized code of Christian morality published by the Author of our religion: it was instilled at various times, and in divers manners; written by the Spirit in the hearts of the Apostles; it was manifested to the first converts by the words, and still more by the examples of their teachers; it showed itself in the whole texture of the sacred books.

Doctrinal truths, again, were also communicated, in various ways, to His disciples, from Him who is the Truth; and impressed, recalled, illumined in their minds, by the Holy Spirit, who brought His words to their remembrance, taught them all things, and led them into the whole truth; by them it

was communicated to their converts, not all at once or in one formula—for that were impossible—but by repeated teaching, by daily inculcation, in divers Churches and at divers times, to simple Christians, and to those who were themselves to teach others; and they who received it were to be themselves led into the full knowledge of it and to keep it, by the Holy Ghost which was given them. To embody the Christian faith in one formulary of words is manifestly impossible. The utmost the Church could do was to take the main points of its faith, those which formed the centre, as it were, around which the rest grew, and to embody these in symbols, which, after all, could but be regarded as heads, sketches, brief hints, of that great body of doctrine which the Christians held. Hence the diversities of these heads amid their agreement. They agree in embodying certain main doctrines, and in some degree in the mode of expression, yet each contains something which is not in the others, indicating the existence of a great body of doctrine spread through the whole Church, which was too extensive, too deep, too subtle, to be confined in a short form of words. The faith dwelt by the Spirit in the Church. It was indicated by portions, by aspects, by varied forms of expression, which, through their very diversities and seeming inconsistencies, showed the depth and extent of that 'knowledge and wisdom,' that science and philosophy, which they failed to exhaust. Thus was faith guarded without being confined; guided and protected without being cramped; the articles of creeds, by their very diversity, showing that they were indexes of, not substitutes for, ideas; aids to the Christian mind in learning the great realities, and preservatives against erring in them.

The case was the same with the early Services. It does not seem as if, at first, anything more than the simple outlines of a ritual were given, fixing the few essential parts, and leaving the rest free. The very diversities of order in parts of the Liturgies is a sign of this: still more the variations of expression; and, so far as we can judge from history and extant remains, these variations were greater in the early than in the later ages. It would seem as if from the beginning there was some settled plan, so that the people knew what was to be done, where they were to join; the order and the substance of the services was settled. There was a well-known combination of thanksgiving and blessing, to which the people responded by an accustomed Amen;[1] there was a settled, 'delivered,' form of commemorating the Institution of the Eucharist;[2] there were requests, deprecations, intercessions, thanksgivings, as the Apostle prescribed.[3] Thus much and more we may trace in the

[1] 1 Cor. xiv. 16. [2] Ibid. xi. 23. [3] 1 Tim. ii. 1, 2.

Epistles. The objects of the requests, the evils to be deprecated, the persons for whom intercession should be made, and the subjects of thanksgiving, were in the main fixed; beyond this it was left to the discretion and prayerful spirit of the Bishop of each Church, to choose the expressions, to enlarge the subjects, to extend or contract the fulness of his prayers. The outlines and general character being thus fixed, the evils of what moderns understand by extempore prayer were avoided, and yet a freedom allowed, which was restrained by the awe and reverence, the age, and we may hope the ordinarily sobered character of the Bishops. Hence we read in S. Justin Martyr,[1] that the celebrant prayed and gave thanks, *ὁσὴ δύναμις αὐτῷ*. Hence, as it would seem, the numerous written liturgical forms of early ages, of which Mone has brought together so many—the Bishop, in process of time, naturally writing down for his own occasional or permanent use what had previously been said only. Hence, probably, the prevalent practice of Bishops composing Missæ for their Churches. Indeed, the transition to settled written forms is indicated by the Canon in the African Collection,[2] of the latter part, probably, of the fourth century, that no one should use prayers which had not been previously approved. The next feature was the gradual adoption of the Liturgies of the greater Churches by those that were subject to them, and the permanence and uniformity of ritual which followed. We will only observe by the way, as a consequence from this, that if a form were now found which professed to be the fixed, written formal Liturgy of any Church, or any number of Churches, in the Antenicene period, the very fact of its professing to be such would throw the strongest suspicion on its genuineness. We may say that there were no such fixed, written Liturgies in the early Antenicene period at least, and that therefore we cannot possibly recover them.

Lastly, of Laws, with which we are now most immediately concerned. In this respect, the freedom of the Gospel Dispensation is most distinguished. It is a Dispensation of universal adaptation; designed to extend to every climate, in every age, under every variety of race, of national life and character, and of civil institutions; accordingly, its settled, fundamental, necessary rules are few and simple; it establishes principles rather than rules; the very regulations which Apostles made were in many instances of local, temporary use only. Hence they were not the same in all Churches. It is sufficiently notorious that different Churches observed different rules, and, as there is every reason to believe, did so, as in the case of the time of celebrating Easter, owing to different rules given by Apostles. There was

[1] Apol. i. c. 67.

[2] C. 70.

of course a disposition to uniformity where there was no reason for diversity, as S. Paul says, 'And so ordain I in all Churches;' and 'as I have given orders in the Church of Galatia, so do ye;' and 'if any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither have the Churches of God.'[1] Again, besides the institutions of our Blessed Lord Himself, there are appointments which we have every reason to believe immutable, from their sacramental character, their intimate connexion with Christian life, their universality, and the fact that they appear to have been regarded as immutable by the whole Church; but even these are variable in their circumstances, and what we may call their accidents. The Apostles, we repeat, gave no formal written codes of rules to their Churches. They made regulations for them, which embodied principles; these regulations were guarded through the number and independence of the Churches, which checked, corrected, informed each the other. In each Church they were preserved as customs. 'Si legem expostules,' says Tertullian (De Cor. Mil. c. 4), 'nullam leges. *Traditio tibi præscribetur auctrix, consuetudo confirmatrix, fides observatrix.*' This is, and must be the case, more or less, in every society. You find numberless societies in which there are few or no written rules. All their regulations are maintained by mutual understanding,—recognised, practised, remembered. This is most true of what we distinctively call 'the rules of Society;' they are not, they cannot be, confined in a written code; they elude formal statement, and exhaust any attempt to enumerate them. This is the case with all societies in simple times, or in young or nascent associations, in which there is an energetic principle of vigorous life; written rules seem rather records of what is dead, or the consequences of mutual misunderstanding. And even where there are some written rules, nay, ever so complete a system, there must be a large and floating appendage of generally understood interpretation, of acknowledged practice or precedent, unwritten, but known and allowed by all. The common law of England in its early state, the customs of particular localities even now, are obvious instances. The customs of a manor, never yet committed to writing, and at all events known and acted upon by those who cannot read, are as well remembered and as accurately determined in their several mutual modifications, apparent opposition, and diversified application, as if, nay much more than if, they were written down. Language fails to express, in the compass of ordinary propositions, those many qualifications

[1] 1 Cor. vii. 17; xvi. 1; xi. 16. See also iv. 17. 'Timothy,' 'who shall bring you into remembrance of my ways which be in Christ, as I teach every where in every Church;' and xiv. 33, 36: 'As in all Churches of the saints;' and in reproof of their self-chosen ways: 'What? came the word of God out from you? or came it unto you only?'

which the mind retains, and has ready to apply at every emergency, and which precedent has fixed. A very simple rule, if drawn out with all its modifications, qualifications, applications, swells into a volume. A society may long act on and use laws without a consciousness of their complicated character. When a difficulty of interpretation or application arises, a specific rule must be made, and this probably will be committed to writing. But each such rule presupposes innumerable unwritten antecedents. Such appears, from all we see in the New Testament and the history of the Church, to have been the condition of the Christian societies. They had received their constitution from their first founders; this was of their essence; they had received also certain fundamental rules respecting sacramental ordinances, for religious worship, and for mutual subordination; they had had a character impressed on them in the principles which they had received—principles of faith, morals, government. These were sacredly guarded; they were the inheritance of the Church, which her pastors diligently preserved. From time to time, new cases arose, and questions about the interpretation or application of old rules; if there was a difficulty in settling these by the aid of analogy, or of admitted principles, neighbouring Churches were consulted, usages were compared, the point was ruled, subject to such revision and reversal as after-knowledge showed to be necessary. This was the origin of the Canons of Councils, or the determinations of particular Bishops or Churches, when the rise of questions among themselves made a decision necessary, or they were appealed to, to settle the difficulties of other Churches; and these were accordingly called ὅροι; they were in writing or not, as the case might be; if in writing, embodied sometimes in a letter from a Council or a Bishop, sometimes in a decree to one or several Churches. But the notion of a Code of Ecclesiastical Law—of a body of regulations which should fix in written rules the entire system of the Church, the free, generous, traditional, yet living scheme of the Church's practice, is inconsistent with the whole character of ancient Christianity; so inconsistent, that decided and unequivocal evidence is necessary to establish it, and to show that any documents professing to be such a code, are other than fictions—whether they profess to include the whole body of Church discipline, or only a considerable part—whether they profess to be of authority over the whole Church, which is in the highest degree self-contradictory, or the constitutions of any one of the great Churches of Alexandria, or Rome, or Antioch.

But we are not placed in the difficult position of having to balance antecedent improbability and positive evidence; of hav-

ing to choose between contradicting the conclusions of reason, or the stubborn authority of facts—for facts remarkably coincide with the view we have given. There is, we repeat, no evidence whatever of the existence of any written body of authoritative Church rules in the Antenicene period.

We shall first give those statements of ancient writers which really do refer to written documents extant in the early Church, and which bear, or seem to bear, or have been thought to bear, on the subject before us. The whole of those passages, which are accumulated by Whiston, where we meet with such expressions as 'commandments, injunctions, appointments, rules, precepts, the apostolical or the ecclesiastical rule,' and the like, down to those of the Nicene Canons, speaking in the singular (if herein we may differ from great authorities) of 'the Rule of the Church,'[1] refer to the common customary law, if we may so call it, of the Church,—whether, like our own common law, it pervaded the whole Church, or was, like customary law, peculiar to some particular Church,—of which such parts only, and that accidentally, were in writing. We shall then examine the works themselves, and see what internal evidence they afford for or against their being what they have been said to be.

The first reference to a *written* document which could be supposed to allude to any portion or element of the Constitutions, is in Origen, in his 10th Homily on Leviticus, written in the first half of the third century, now extant only in Latin. He is speaking of the Christian order of fasting, and says,—'Sed est et alia adhuc religiosa (jejunandi ratio), cujus laus quo-'rundam Apostolorum literis prædicatur. Invenimus enim in 'quodam libello ab Apostolis dictum: Beatus est qui etiam 'jejunat præ eo ut alat pauperem. Hujus jejunium valde accep-'tum est apud Deum et revera digne satis: imitatur enim Illum, 'qui animam suam posuit pro fratribus suis.' There was then a work, 'a little book,' which bore the name of some 'Apostles,' out of which Origen cited these words. But neither these words, nor any which could be supposed to be intended by the writer, are to be found in any documents, Constitutions, or Canons, that have as yet been discovered; though rules, embodying the principle, are, as is natural, repeatedly given.[2] All we would further observe is, that the book cited was a small one—that it is not spoken of as a work of any recognised authority—nor

[1] It may be considered whether the expression, *ὁ κανών*, in Canons ix. x. xiii. xv. of the Council of Nice, means generally the rule of the Church, or a specific Canon.

[2] See the Apostolical Constitution, v. 1, which might have been an amplification of this idea.

even as representing apostolical or ecclesiastical ordinances. Indeed the contrary seems almost certain. It is not at all likely that Origen would have spoken in these terms of a well-known and authoritative body of Church rules.

We find in a work of later date, falsely bearing the name of S. Cyprian, *De Aleatoribus*, a citation from the *Doctrinæ Apostolorum*, amongst citations from the Epistles of S. Paul; 'Et in 'Doctrinis Apostolorum; "si quis fratrum delinquit in ecclesia, 'et non paret legi; hic nec colligatur donec pœnitentiam agat, 'et non recipiatur, ne inquinetur et impediatur oratio vestra." This citation again is not to be found in any of the documents as yet known.[1] There was a well-known book called by this name, 'The Doctrine or Doctrines of the Apostles,' but it was, as we shall afterwards more fully show, on the whole, a book of practical teaching, and not *of authority*, as a collection of Church rules.

The next statements, after Origen's, bearing on the subject, are found in the early part of the fourth century; they occur in the lists of Sacred Books given by Eusebius and by S. Athanasius. In the well-known list of Eusebius, after the enumeration of the allowed and the disputed books, we read:[2] 'And in 'the class of spurious books (*νόθοι*) should be placed the Book 'of the Acts of Paul, and what is called the Shepherd, and the 'Revelation of Peter; and besides them the Epistle that is cir-'culated under the name of Barnabas, and what are called the '*Teachings of the Apostles*' (*καὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων αἱ λεγόμεναι διδαχαί*). The place of these *διδαχαὶ* in this classification shows that they were not regarded as heretical, but were read amongst Catholic Christians (which is the reason Eusebius gives for enumerating them in this list), but were not genuine works of the Apostles. Eusebius, like the Pseudo-Cyprian, speaks of the work in the plural; Ruffinus, in translating this passage, uses the singular ('Doctrina quæ dicitur Apostolorum'), as Athanasius does in the words we are about to cite.

In his Thirty-ninth Festal Epistle, of which a part only is extant, S. Athanasius enumerates the books of the Sacred Canon, with the view of putting his people on their guard against heretical works. After giving a list of the books of the New Testament, just as we have them,[3] and after marking them off from all others, he proceeds: 'But, for greater exactness, I am bound 'to add also, that besides these, there are other books, not admitted 'into the Canon indeed, but appointed of the Fathers to be read

[1] See the Apost. Const. ii. 37, 38, 39, where much to this effect occurs; which might have been an amplification of it.
[2] Hist. Eccl. iii. 25.
[3] Op. S. Athan. i. 963. ed. Ben.

'by those that are just coming over to us, and wish to be in-'structed in the doctrine of godliness; the Wisdom of Solomon, 'and the Wisdom of Sirach, and Esther, and Judith, and 'Tobias, and what is called the Teaching of the Apostles, '(διδαχὴ καλουμένη τῶν ἀποστόλων), and the Shepherd.' He adds, that whilst the books he had before mentioned were in the Canon, and these latter were read, there was no place for apocryphal books, which were the invention of heretics.

The way in which this work is mentioned; the other books with which it is classed; the use to which it was applied, viz. for the reading of converts, in order to their instruction 'in the doctrine of godliness;' the fact that there is no hint whatever of its being a body of Church rules, to which all deferred,—seem to indicate almost certainly that it was not at all a work of that kind; though it may have contained matter respecting ecclesiastical regulations of an unauthoritative and practical character.

Again, we read, in a list of sacred books in Ruffinus, on the Creed, § 36: 'It is to be known, however, that there are also 'other books which are not called canonical, but ecclesiastical 'books by our Fathers, as the Wisdom of Solomon . . . . the 'Wisdom of the Son of Sirach . . . . the Book of Tobias, and 'Judith, and the Books of the Maccabees. In the New Tes-'tament, the book which is called that of the Shepherd, or of 'Hermas; that which is called the Two Ways, or the Judgment 'of Peter; all which they willed should be read in the Churches, 'but not adduced to establish the doctrines of the faith.'

It will be seen that Ruffinus' list nearly agrees with that of S. Athanasius, and that he keeps these sacred books distinct from the large class of apocryphal works among which the next age placed them. But the *Doctrina Apostolorum*, which he himself had found in Eusebius, and expressed carefully in the singular in his own translation, disappears here, and the 'Two Ways, or the Judgment of Peter,' comes in its place. We should naturally be disposed to identify these, and to consider this another name for the Doctrina; but of that presently. We are now ascertaining the authority of these books, not identifying them.

And we apprehend that we may safely infer, that thus far there is no evidence of the existence of any authoritative book or books of Church rules in the first four centuries. The only plausible supposition is, that the *Doctrina Apostolorum* was of that kind; but the fact of its being classed with such books as it is, and its being designed for the use of Catechumens, seems quite to exclude it.

We now, however, come to evidence of the existence of our Constitutions towards the close of the fourth century (A.D. 736)

in the writings of S. Epiphanius. We must premise what seems to be the generally admitted view with respect to the eight books of Constitutions, that the substance of the first six books originally formed a distinct work, as they are found in Oriental versions, in Arabic, Æthiopic, and Syriac, bearing the title of the Didascalia of the Apostles, or the Catholic Didascalia; the remainder, the last two books (and perhaps parts of others), having been made up of smaller portions combined together, and altered in order to their combination. Now, in Epiphanius, we clearly identify this work, the main body of the present Constitutions, by several citations made by him from the first five books, though from a text differing from that which we have; and we have also Epiphanius's distinct statement of his own views respecting the authority of the book which he is citing.

In Hær. 45, n. 5, he says: 'The Apostles also say in what is called the διάταξις—the Constitution;' citing, in somewhat different form, our Constitutions. In Hær. 70, n. 10: 'And to 'prove this the Audiani allege (wrongly) the Constitution (διά-'ταξις) of the Apostles, which is a disputed book with the 'generality of Christians, but is not to be rejected (οὖσαν ἐν 'ἀμφιλέκτῳ τοῖς πολλοῖς, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀδόκιμον). For the entire 'canonical order is contained in it, and no point of the faith is 'misstated, nor yet of the confession, nor of the ecclesiastical 'administration, and the rule, and the faith.' This is followed by a citation directly contradictory to our present text. In other places he cites the work thus (ib. n. 11, 12), 'The Apostles say:' and the like: in one (80. 7), ὁ θεῖος λόγος says: in another (75. 6), 'And if it is right to allege the passage of the Constitution of the Apostles.'

In Epiphanius, then, we have evidence of the existence of the Constitutions, of the commonly received opinion respecting them, and of his own. But the opinion of Epiphanius on a point of this kind is not of much weight. He was anything but a critical or a discerning writer. He is of more use in that he states what the opinions of others were, as to the character of the work. It was, as he plainly states, a book of questionable authority with the great body of Christians, and he himself only says he does not think it ought to be rejected. His testimony is more valuable in that he attests that the book gives a true picture of the faith, and of the ecclesiastical discipline and system, which it might do without being an apostolical, or even an authoritative book. That it was not a work of recognised authority is certain, because he states explicitly that it was not, though esteeming it himself. As we have before said, a code of laws must, by the very force of the terms, be a work of acknowledged authority,

generally recognised; and the Constitutions were not such even on the statement of one most disposed to esteem them. That the book so called is a literary composition intended to depict, as if of an apostolical original, actually existing regulations, is a very probable opinion. But it lessens the weight of the authority of the collection, in such degree as we suppose the writer to give a limited view, or a distorted one.

Again, we find two citations, intended apparently to be from this collection, our present Constitutions, in a work to which we shall refer presently, the Opus Imperfectum of S. Chrysostom, as it is falsely called, on S. Matthew; one of which cites the *eighth* book, proving that at the time that book, or those words were written (for they may be an interpolation), the collection was made into eight books; the other is a citation of a passage which is not in our text. This is the evidence respecting the Constitutions.

After these we may place the statement of a later writer, whose work, called and being a Synopsis of Holy Scripture, passes under the name of Athanasius, and is included among the treatises of doubtful genuineness in the editions of that Father's works, but which, at least as respects this list of Sacred Books, is confessedly spurious, and is placed by Fabricius in the middle of the fifth century, and by some recent writers as late as the tenth, being regarded as based on the stichometries which we shall mention next. In this work we find a list of the disputed books differing so widely from that of the Synodal Epistle, that Tillemont, in maintaining that the Synopsis was the work of S. Athanasius, was obliged to say that this list was an interpolation. It includes 'the Travels of Peter, the Travels of John, 'the Travels of Thomas, the Gospel according to Thomas, the 'Doctrine of the Apostles, the Clementia, out of which what is 'more true and divinely inspired has been selected and inter-'preted,' &c. We observe that the Κλημέντια first appears here, together with these several grossly spurious books; it is plain that the list of uncanonical writings contains a class of books of very much lower character than the lists of the fourth century; and it would seem that the few old books which alone Eusebius and Athanasius mentioned, had, in the course of time, sunk considerably in esteem, and were put on a level with books which, in the Nicene period, were held as of much less account. We cite the passage for its mention of the *Doctrina Apostolorum;* of the Clementia we shall speak again.

Again, there are extant two ancient catalogues of canonical and spurious books, in which these writings occur, which may further aid us in seeing what they were.

The first is the old Stichometry at the end of Nicephorus's

Chronography; that is, the list of books, with the number of lines in each, according to the established mode of copying in line. This list is the same as that of the Pseudo-Athanasius just cited; and their agreement is an argument with Fabricius for setting the date of the Stichometry earlier than the time of Nicephorus; and with Credner, for supposing that the Synopsis is based on the Stichometry; it is extant in Greek, and also in a Latin Translation at the end of the Ecclesiastical History of Anastasius the Librarian, which is of value as confirming the correctness of the number of στίχοι in the case of each particular work.

'APOCRYPHAL BOOKS.

'The Travels of Peter	2,800 lines.
The Travels of John	2,500 ,,
The Travels of Thomas	1,600 ,,
The Gospel according to Thomas	1,300 ,,
The Teaching of the Apostles (*Doctrina Apostolorum*)	200 ,,
Of Clement (Κλήμεντος, *i.e.* the Teaching of Clement)	2,600[1] ,,
Of Ignatius, Polycarp, and Hermas.'	

Another list, without the number of lines, is as follows:—

'The History of James.
The Revelation of Peter.
The Journeys and Teachings (διδαχαὶ) of the Apostles (we would draw attention to the plural).
The Epistle of Barnabas.
The Acts of Paul.
The Revelation of Paul.
The Doctrine of Clement.
The Doctrine of Ignatius.
The Doctrine of Polycarp.
The Gospel according to Barnabas.
The Gospel according to Matthias.'

We bring these lists together because of their illustrating each other; only adding, that so far as the number of στίχοι can be a guide to us—which, from the irregularity of the length of the στίχοι, it can only be somewhat uncertainly—the *Doctrina Apostolorum* was shorter than the Book of Canticles, which had 280 στίχοι, and the Clementis Doctrina as long as the Gospel of S. Luke. Grabe conjectured, and we think very justly, that the Clementia and Doctrina Clementis were the same, and were the then received form of the early portion of the Constitutions; on that view they are the διατάξεις cited by Epiphanius, which, in his time, about A.D. 400, were rejected by most, but were included in the later and larger lists of apocryphal books, together with the Travels of the Apostles, &c., which had not been

[1] There is some doubt about this reading, some make it 6,000.

of sufficient esteem to be mentioned in the lists of Eusebius, Athanasius, and Ruffinus. Grabe thought that the Doctrina Apostolorum, and the other Doctrinæ, were some of the various tracts which were made up into the eight books. It was this catalogue which suggested that view to Bishop Pearson. What the Doctrina Apostolorum was, we think we may see more clearly hereafter.

What, then, is the result? There is no single citation out of, no single reference to, any written collection of *authoritative* Constitutions, in any writer of the first four centuries. Whilst there are innumerable evidences of the existence of an understood system of Church government and regulations, there is no trace whatever of any Church rules being embodied as an authoritative code, or committed to writing, except in the letters of Bishops, Canons of Councils, or other similar detached forms. Of the books which might be supposed to contain such collections, one, the *Doctrina Apostolorum,* was not recognised as of such a kind; and the chief part of the Constitutions which we now have, though in a different form, and a different text, existed, but was not held to be of authority, and indeed contained matter opposed to the practice of the Universal Church.

If, then, any works did exist, as it seems certain from extant remains that they did, bearing the semblance of Church rules, we must hold that they were private compositions, or representations of some local and temporary customs, or mere fictions. And the examination of the works themselves will confirm this view.

It will appear, we think, as we proceed, that persons wrote books professing to be the appointments of the Apostles, in which they depicted, but rhetorically and fancifully, as writers of fiction would do, the practice of the Church, as in their own judgment it was, or, perhaps, ought to be. Hence, if we could recover the writings in question in their original primitive form, we should not be able to rely on them as representing to us the true state of the Church, any more than we could infer from the Acts of Paul and Thecla that women ordinarily baptized. Epiphanius, indeed, might be alleged as endorsing their statements, but his expressions are too general to be pressed very closely; especially as in one of the places which he cites, the Constitutions (according to his copies) directly contradicted the practice of the universal Church. The very autographs of the writers, then, could we recover them, would deserve no higher authority than that which is due to the composers of fictions, and of Utopias, to whom there attaches a general want of confidence. It is necessary to receive all their assertions with caution; to check them by the testimony of writers of known

authority; and to give them only the place of subsidiary or confirmatory witnesses.

The result of our investigations thus far, as to the authority of any collections of so-called Apostolical ordinances, may materially lessen the interest with which we enter upon the next part of our subject—the inquiry what the primary forms of these works were, and how far we now possess the means of restoring them to their original state. Still that inquiry is not unimportant; because these works, if ancient (and with their text unaltered), might, as we have said, have an indirect historical value, as showing incidentally, and in correspondence with other evidence, the practices or views of their own day.

We have already stated what is the generally received view on the subject, as a whole; namely, that the entire work, our Eight Books of Apostolical Constitutions, consists, first, of a long work, the original, the first six of these books, and, then, of several shorter tracts on kindred subjects, dovetailed together, and occupying the rest of the collection. That the work is thus made up of divers tracts, is clear from the general want of internal unity, method, or connexion; the difference of style in the various portions, and sometimes statements almost contradictory; the same topics being treated over again in different places; besides a formal conclusion at the end of the sixth book, and other indications of their being distinct works joined together. The suspicions which these internal marks suggest, are established by our finding these several portions actually existing as distinct works.

The first and largest portion, the first six books, is already known to be extant in Syriac, in Æthiopic, and in Arabic, not made into separate books, but divided into chapters, differing in their divisions, and with some dislocation of their various parts in the several versions. It bears the name of the Catholic Didascalia, or the Didascalia of the Apostles; this seems to have been its proper name; and it is that which we shall use in speaking of it.

Further, the substance of the first portion of the seventh book is extant in Greek, in the *διατάξεις*, printed by Bickell from the Vienna MS. so often referred to by Grabe. This we believe may be the Doctrina Apostolorum, *Διδαχὴ τῶν Ἀποστόλων*, of Athanasius and Eusebius; the *Duæ Viæ*, or Judgment of Peter, of Ruffinus. In embodying it in the Constitutions, the compiler has omitted the latter portion, on Ecclesiastical Offices, and robbed the former of all those parts which gave it its dramatic character as an actual conference of the Apostles.

An earlier form of the eighth book is extant as a separate

work, in Greek, but without the chapter, that was apparently introduced by a compiler to connect it with the rest when it was embodied with them; itself being demonstrably made up of divers shorter pieces. From this collection being connected with the name of Hippolytus, and a portion of it being probably written by him, we shall call these the Hippolytean Collection.

Thus we have three of the components of our Constitutions, —the Didascaly, which forms the bulk of the work; the Duæ Viæ; the Hippolytean Constitutions. The remaining elements are—a list of Bishops ordained by the Apostles; a Collection of prayers and ritual forms, in the latter part of the seventh book, which appear, from several signs, to be separate works joined on to each other.

Lastly, it must be stated, that in the various forms of these works, or parts of them which appear now in versions, or are cited by ancient authors, there are portions which are not included in our eight books; *e.g.* in the short collections in Coptic and Æthiopic, corresponding to the Hippolytean, there is much matter that does not appear there; and there are portions of the Didascaly (the first six books) in Æthiopic and Arabic, which are not in the Greek in our eight books. The eight books, then, are made up out of several of these earlier works, omitting portions and adapting them together.

As to the time when this work was so put together, we do not know; we can only approximate to it. In the last of the so-called Apostolic Canons, probably made up when those Canons were appended to the Constitutions, we read in the list of sacred books, 'And the Constitutions, in eight books, given to you, the Bishops, by the hand of me, Clement.' The authority of this is absolutely nothing; the date uncertain. The Constitutions, as one work, is cited by Maximus early in the seventh century. The Trullan Council at the end of the seventh century, refer to the above Canon, but reject the Constitutions as having been interpolated by heretics. It seems that they were then received as we have them. Prior to this, in the curious Arian book which we have mentioned, the *Opus Imperfectum* of the pseudo-Chrysostom on S. Matthew, which was probably composed in the fifth century, we find the eighth book distinctly cited as the 'eighth book of the Canons of the Apostles' (on Matt. xxv. 18). This, however, may have been a later interpolation, for there are such in this *Opus Imperfectum*. But there is no reason against believing that the eight books were put together even as early as the latter part of the fifth century. And that it was not done earlier, may be inferred from the fact, that we do not find any Oriental version of the eight books as a whole, only of their elementary parts; a strong indication that

in the year 451, when the Egyptian, Æthiopic, and Syriac Churches were severed from the communion of the Greeks and Latins, the composite work, our eight books, had not been put together.

It is then in the elementary portions of the Constitutions, or the works out of which they were made up, or others cognate to them, that we must hope to recover the earlier forms. Now, of these component parts, we believe the fiction out of which the beginning of the seventh book was made may be the Doctrina Apostolorum, and that this was a work of the early part of the second century; recommended to the use of catechumens, and read in some churches. The Didascaly we should put at the latter part of the third century, as, besides internal evidence, which we shall state presently, it is regarded by Epiphanius as an Apostolic book, and is first found (if we identify it with the Clementia) in the list of spurious sacred books in the Stichometry, and the 'Synopsis Sacræ Scripturæ.' Of the Hippolytean and the cognate collection, which we must call the Coptic, we shall speak more distinctly afterwards.

Now if these productions are to be, in any measure, of use as an evidence of the faith and usage of the primitive ages, it is clear that we must ascertain with tolerable assurance that the text which we have is in substance the same as that which existed in the early times. But here we fail miserably. The words cited by Origen, from (apparently) some book of the kind, are not found in any of the compositions which have yet been brought to light; neither are those cited by the pseudo-Cyprian. The work which Epiphanius had was, as far as appears, the Didascaly, the first six books; it is only out of this portion of the book that his citations are made, nor is there any reason to suppose that the other tracts had at that time been combined with it. But the text which Epiphanius cited, contained passages which are no longer extant; and in those that are extant the readings are materially different, and in one place, as we have said, directly contradictory to the words cited by Epiphanius. That is, the text Epiphanius had, has been retrenched, modified, altered, by later hands, so as to contradict what it said before; so as, in Grabe's words, to turn affirmatives into negatives, and negatives into affirmatives. In the very passage in which he expresses his own view of the value of the Constitutions, and asserts that there is nothing misstated in them as respects the faith or practice of the Church, he cites the words of the Constitutions as requiring the celebration of Easter at the same time as it was kept by their brethren of the Circumcision. He argues, indeed, that it does not mean what it was

supposed to do; and what, indeed, it obviously did mean: but in our present text the words have disappeared, and very full and strong statements of the opposite rule are found instead.

Of the two citations in the *Opus Imperfectum* of the pseudo-Chrysostom in the fifth century, one is found in our eighth book; the other cannot be found at all, any more than those of Origen and the pseudo-Cyprian.

The citations which are found after this, in Maximus and others, agree with our present text, so that we may fairly suppose that the work, as we have it, was current in its present form in the Greek Church at the end of the sixth century.

From the citations, therefore, in the Greek and Latin Fathers, we infer that the text of these books had undergone very great alteration after the fourth, and perhaps the middle of the fifth century. This will be still more manifest after we have considered the versions of the elementary portions of the work in the languages of the East.

I. Syriac.—We take the Syriac Version first, because it may naturally be expected to represent these works in an earlier form than any other version, and, in a critical point of view, to be most valuable, from the learning of the Syriac-speaking Christians being superior to that of any others who did not use the Greek or Latin language.

Now in the Syriac we at present know of the following:—

1. A version of a portion of the pseudo-Hippolytean Constitutions, contained in a collection of canons in one of the Syriac MSS. in the British Museum, brought from Egypt. A translation of this portion of the MS. was made by Mr. Cureton for the Chevalier Bunsen, and an analysis of its contents, compared with those of the Greek text, is given in the Age of Hippolytus, vol. ii. pp. 347, 348. The portion thus found separately, begins at a point where there is an evident break, and, so to say, a new subject opened in the Greek Collection; and the fact that it is thus found distinct, confirms the supposition which we should have formed from the internal marks of the Greek itself, that the Hippolytean Collection (forming the eighth book of the Constitutions) is itself made up of other smaller sets of canons; whilst the different place occupied in the series by another portion, On Catechumens, in this, as well as in the Coptic Versions, points to the same fact.

2. A version of the first six books, *i. e.* the Didascaly; of which a MS. is extant in the Library at Paris. This has been examined by Dr. Zenker, and an analysis and extracts from it are printed by Bickell, pp. 148—159. Bickell holds it to be a collection of extracts; Bunsen, an earlier form of the Didas-

caly, which, he says, remarkably coincides with what he had himself previously written as to the additions made to the original, when he had access only to the common Greek text. We trust that this Syriac version will be published entire in the next edition of the Chevalier's work, because it is impossible to judge satisfactorily on such points without having the whole before us.

3. A MS. version of the Didascaly from which Abraham Ecchellensis printed extracts in his work *De Alexandrinæ Ecclesiæ Originibus*. Some of these are extracted by Grabe, and compared with the present Greek text. They will exhibit the change which the text had undergone by interpolation—the passages that are in our Greek, and are not in the Syriac, being included in brackets. The first extract is from lib. ii. c. 11 :—

'Therefore, O Bishop, study to be pure (unblameable) in thy doings, knowing thy station (τόπον, present Greek τρόπον) [and thy dignity], as representing God among men, by ruling over all men, priests, emperors, magistrates, fathers, sons, teachers, and all that are subject to thee alike]. And so sit in the Church, when speaking the word, as one that has power to judge those that have sinned; because to you Bishops it has been said: "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."'

The second, from the 25th and 26th chapters of the second book :—

'And such are now the .... oblations, which are offered by the holy Bishops to the Lord God [through Jesus Christ who died for us], for these are your High Priests; and your Priests are the Presbyters; and your Levites, the deacons that now are [and the readers, and singers, and doorkeepers; your deaconesses, and widows, and virgins, and orphans]; but the High Priest that is higher than all these, is the Bishop.[1] He is the minister of the Word [the guardian of knowledge], the mediator [between God and you in your services to Him]; the teacher [of godliness]; your father, after God, who begat you [unto adoption] through water [and the Spirit]; he is your ruler and governor; your king and potentate; he is your God on earth after God, who ought to enjoy honour from you: [for concerning him, and those that are like him, God said, "I have said ye are Gods; and ye are all the sons of the Most High;" and thou shalt not speak evil of the Gods.[2]] Let your Bishop preside over you, honoured as with the honour of God, whereby he has authority over the Clergy, and rules over all the people.'

It will appear, we think, that the additions are those of a rhetorical amplifier, disposed, indeed, to exaggerate what he found, but not materially altering the doctrine of his original. We will only call attention to the substance of the citation even in the simple Syriac, and observe that we are not the parties that suppose these statements to be the authoritative exponents of the Church views of the third century.

[1] The division into chapters in our Greek severs these words incorrectly.
[2] Exod. xxii. 28, LXX.; and Hebrew literally.

II. Coptic.—Next to the Syriac in probable antiquity, are the Coptic Versions. We use the word Coptic in a general sense, as including both the Memphitic, or dialect of Lower Egypt, and the Sahidic, that of Upper Egypt.

These Coptic collections were first made known to us by the publication which we have placed at the head of this article, being the text and an English translation, edited by Dr. Tattam, for the Oriental Translation Fund. It is a most valuable accession to our means of knowledge on these subjects, and as it has opened to us much that was not known before, we shall speak of it more at length.

And first of the Coptic text. Few of our readers would be prepared to hear that this Coptic version of Apostolical Canons is a work of the nineteenth century: but so it is. The text published by Dr. Tattam is a translation in Coptic, *i. e.* the dialect of Lower Egypt, made from the Sahidic, that of Upper Egypt, just fifty years ago, and is accompanied with an Arabic translation, which he used to aid him in determining the meaning of the Coptic. This fact brings vividly home to us the life and works of the Egyptian monks, who, even to this time, are transcribing and translating these ancient and simple documents, on the view (perhaps) that they are Apostolic.

The following are the concluding words of the work as translated by Dr. Tattam: they exhibit a specimen of the truly Oriental language of the Egyptian Christians of our own times:—

'The end of the Canons of our Fathers the Holy Apostles; these are the Seven Books which are by the hands of Clemens, in the peace of God. Amen.

'1520 of Diocletian. Translated from the language of Upper Egypt into the language of Lower Egypt, according to his ability, by the poor dust, the least of the Presbyters, George of Kosma.

'In the collection of our honoured father the skilful scribe of the language, the great among the Bishops, the holy Athanasius, at the seat of the repository.

'In the government of our holy Patriarch, the honoured sun of the faith, the light of the thoughts, our father, the great Archbishop Abba Marcus, the Patriarch of the great city Alexandria: the God of heaven establish him upon his throne many years, and in peaceful times, that he may humble all his enemies under his feet quickly, for ever. Amen.'

The margin adds, in another hand—'the 108th of the number of our fathers the Patriarchs.'

The year 1520 of Diocletian is our A.D. 1803-4, and in Mr. Neale's list of the Bishops of Alexandria,[1] we recognise as 'Mark VIII. the 108th Patriarch,' 'under whom the French invasion of Egypt took place,' the Abba Marcus, 'the honoured

[1] History of the Eastern Church, Patriarchate of Alexandria; vol. ii. p. 474.

Sun of the Faith, the Light of the Thoughts.' Any objection, however, to the correctness of the text, arising from the recent period at which this translation was made, is to a great extent obviated by the information given us by Dr. Tattam in his Preface, that he has a copy of the Sahidic of the greater part of the work; this he collated with the Coptic, with which, he says, it perfectly agrees. For critical purposes the Sahidic ought to have been printed, as the part which is not in the Sahidic is one of the portions out of which one separate collection seems to have been made up, and it would be important to ascertain whether it was really wanting originally, or only displaced, to the end of the whole, and so lost.

The entire Coptic collection is composed of four distinct portions, which we must distinguish by letters:—A. The *Duæ Viæ*, of which we have the Greek in Bickell. B. A modified form of the Hippolytean Collection, with some considerable additions on the rites of Baptism and Confirmation. C. The Hippolytean Collection itself, stripped of its titles and dramatic character': as 'the Constitution of Matthew,' 'I Matthew ordain,' &c., and in a state between that in which it exists separately, and that in which it is embodied in the eight books of Constitutions. D. The well-known 'Canons of the Apostles,' slightly varying from our common editions. Of the incongruities, repetitions, and contradictions of this consarcination we shall speak presently. We are now concerned with its external form and changes.

It is divided into seven books, or, as they clearly once were, eight; the division of the first and second being omitted by some transcriber, and so lost; those who copied his transcript being reduced to difficulties such as are shown by the following words; at pp. 30—32 (we cite Dr. Tattam's translation), at the end of the first treatise (A):—

'The first Book of the Canons of our Fathers the Apostles is finished, which are in the hands of Clemens; and this is the second Book, in the peace of God. Amen.

'In the name of God the Most Holy.

'The second Book of the Canons of our Fathers the Apostles, by the hands of Clemens, which is the Third Book.'

From the slipping out of the ending of the first book, by which the original second became part of the first, this double numbering arises, which goes on through the whole collection. Now, this dividing into eight books, and attributing the work to Clement, does not belong to the earliest condition of the collection, even as far as we have information respecting it: it appears from Wansleb's History of the Church of Alexandria (the passage is cited by Dr. Tattam in his Preface, p. v.), that this Coptic Collection used to be divided into two books,

the first containing the forms of the Constitutions, (our parts A, B, C,) the second the Canons; and the collection is still extant in this form in Æthiopic, in which the first book is called the Synods of the Apostles; the second, the Synods of the Church. It seems pretty plain that some transcriber wished to make it appear that this collection was the 'eight books of Constitutions, by the hand of Clement,' which was mentioned in the last Apostolical canon in the Greek, either dishonestly, or because he really thought it was so, and only made this division and added the titles in the spirit of an overwise corrector. Anyhow, we must regard this as one of the changes which the collection has undergone; but it is useful, as marking some of the breaks between the minor portions of the whole. The first portion (A) divides itself naturally into two parts at the place where the practical teaching of the Duæ Viæ ends, and the rules respecting Church Offices begins. The second portion (B) makes the third book. The Hippolytean Collection (C) is divided into four (*i. e.* the 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th) books; the first point of division being at a natural break, at the end of an Homiletic discourse about spiritual gifts attributed to S. Hippolytus; the second, at the place where another of the minor elementary portions, as it appears from internal evidence to be, and which is found separate in Syriac, begins. The seventh book is made up of a portion which is found in a different place in this Coptic Collection from what it is in the Greek, in which it occurs in the middle of the Coptic fifth. The Apostolical Canons, the second book of the Æthiopic and old Coptic, makes the eighth book.

What we have to notice in the whole collection is this;—it is most clumsily made, and appears to have been the work of hands so very unskilful, that it puts together as parts of one body of Church Rules, several different collections, and even different forms of the same collection, so as to repeat itself, pages on pages being simply repetitions; so as to contradict itself, by constitutions directly opposed to each other; so as to go over the same ground in different parts in a way which partakes of the character of repetition and contradiction, and runs into various shades between the two. Many of these points will come in more naturally when we speak of the history of the Hippolytean Collection, and of those portions which have hitherto only been found in Æthiopic and Coptic, and for the most part have only been printed and translated from the Coptic.

It need scarcely be said that this Coptic Collection was translated, so far as we can judge, from the Greek; in those places where it has anything which we have not extant in Greek, we cannot judge, of course, whether they are in any

degree additions, made by the Copt, or were in his Greek copy. But it is plain, in some places, that the translator had a different reading from our present Greek (in one passage enabling us to correct it); in others, that he misunderstood the meaning of his original; *e. g.* p. 8, we read: 'Be not emulous, neither be contentious, nor quarrelsome, for *envy* proceeds from these.' He read φθόνος, the Greek φόνος: the context shows that 'murder' is meant.

P. 16: Ψηφίσασθαι, meaning to 'vote' in the election of a bishop, is misunderstood in the Copt, 'to make a dedication for pious uses for the bishop.'

P. 108: 'But the Devil also, and the demons which are under 'him, foretell many things; but *miracles have not at all on this* 'account been done by them for the service of God, for they have 'done them entirely in ignorance, on account of the evil which 'they desired to do.' The Greek is, as indeed the argument requires, 'Yet is there not in them owing to this one spark of godliness' (οὐ παρὰ τοῦτο μέν ἐστιν αὐτοῖς εὐσεβείας σπινθήρ). In the same page (we take these things quite accidentally), 'Neither a bishop who is *content* with ignorance;' (Arabic, 'is content, satisfied;') Greek, *pressed down by*, πεπιέσμενος.

P. 138: 'And let all believers *pray* their servants in meekness.' The Arabic, wishing to make this clearer, translates it, 'let them call to,' or 'order.' The Greek is προσεχέτωσαν, let them 'bear themselves towards.' The Coptic read, or misunderstood the Greek to be, προσευχέτωσαν.

As one reads Dr. Tattam's book one sees that the cause why the matter which appears in his translation is so often utterly unintelligible, is, that the original is presented through the refracting medium of the Coptic; this must be the case, even independently of mistakes, in languages of quite different idioms. It is highly probable, however, that much of this might have been avoided if the Greek had been used as a guide to settle the meaning of the Coptic; and also if the translation had been made by one who was familiar with ecclesiastical antiquity and liturgical terms; *e. g.* Eucharist is sometimes translated 'thanksgiving;' 'to offer' (προσφέρειν), 'to put on;' and the προσφορά (the Oblation), 'the Holy Communion.'[1] But, independently of this, it is quite clear that we cannot in any way argue with safety from the expressions of the Coptic,

[1] At p. 68 we find 'the Lord's Supper;' a correct and literal translation of the Coptic. 'Let not the Catechumens come in to the Lord's Supper with a faithful person. And let him who calleth remember him who hath called him, as often as they eat,' &c. But it is not the Holy Communion which is meant, but a feast of charity, an evidence that the κυριακὸν δεῖπνον was then understood to be (as S. Chrysostom understands it in S. Paul) the supper which followed the Holy Communion, not the Communion itself. See Estius in loc.

because it is a translation originally made by ignorant and uncritical men, and has been subjected to a series of copyings and we know not what other modifications by successive generations of ignorant men; not to dwell on the fact that the whole collection, whether originally made by a Greek or a Copt, is most uncritically put together, and—a point to which we shall refer again—that it has been, in Greek, and perhaps even in Coptic, the subject of repeated successive interpolations.

III. ÆTHIOPIC.—In Æthiopic there is extant (*a*) in MS., partly printed, the compilation of four collections which we have just been describing as found in Coptic, A, B, C, D; and the observations we have made concerning the one apply in great measure to the other. The prominent point of difference is (as we have already noticed) that the Æthiopic is not divided into eight books, nor has the whole acquired the false title of being 'by Clement,' which is distinctively given to the Apostolical Canons that form its second book. In a preface and table of contents prefixed to the collection, the first book, being the first six of the Coptic, A, B, C, is called, 'A Collection of the Canons of our Fathers the Apostles;' the second, 'Ecclesiastical Canons, which the Apostles delivered by Clement.'

But besides this there are differences in detail which it is probable would appear much more decidedly if the whole text was published from the MSS. As it is, a part only has been printed, namely, the first tract, A, our *Duæ Viæ*, and the beginning of the second portion, B, the greatly modified form of the Hippolytean Collection, down to the ordination of deacons. These were printed by Ludolf in his Commentaries on the History of Æthiopia. A, from p. 314 to p. 323; B, from p. 323 to p. 328. For the rest we have only the table of contents: but this is sufficient to identify the collections.

The Apostolical Canons are extant also in a separate form; the titles and some portions of them are printed in Ludolf, pp. 330—333. Judging from these titles, the 47th, 49th, and 50th canons, on heretical baptism, are omitted, as they and the 48th are in the Coptic.

β. The Hippolytean Collection, or, as the Æthiopians call it, the Canons of Abulides, again, exists in a separate form, and, so far as we can judge from the titles of the chapters, with very considerable additions and modifications; *e. g.* c. 13 is, 'De loco quem summi reges aut principes tenebant in templo.' The partiality of those Churches for this collection appears from its existing in so many forms among them. The name of Hippolytus, perhaps, carried greater weight, because they, whether rightly or not, believed he was a Bishop of Rome; and they

appear also very carefully to have translated all the editions, if we may so call them, *i.e.* all the varying forms which they met with of these ritual and other rules,—to have translated them and kept them as if they were distinct sets of canons, though they were only the same in various editions.

γ. The Didascaly, or great Constitution—that which we have often mentioned as being the substance of the first six of our eight books. It is a portion of this which the late Mr. Platt printed with an English version for the Oriental Translation Fund. In Ludolf, pp. 334, 335, the titles of the chapters of this Didascalia are given, translated from Wansleb. These were compared by Grabe with an Arabic MS. in the Bodleian, and found to agree with it; and in his little essay he drew out a comparative table of the contents of these versions with the Greek Constitutions in eight books, from which he concluded that there were several dislocations, the arrangement of considerable portions being different in the two. Of the text itself no part was printed till 1834, when Mr. Platt published a large portion, accompanied by an English translation and notes. The MS. he used contained this portion only, going down to the thirteenth chapter of the fourth book of our Greek. So far as this goes there are no *dislocations*, and the text shows that what appeared to Grabe, judging from the titles of chapters, to be dislocations, are not really such.

Mr. Platt, in editing and translating this work, compared it carefully with the Greek; the result of his comparison and his general judgment of the version, is given in the following words from his Preface:—

'It is, in fact, a very loose and inaccurate translation of the 'Apostolical Constitutions. The subjects occur in the same 'order as in the original, and the translation of clauses, and 'even of particular words of the Greek text, may be perpetu-'ally traced throughout; but many additions are made to it, 'and the omissions are yet more numerous; *and* they are often 'omissions of a kind that entirely obscure or destroy the sense. 'The latter part of an argument, for instance, will be omitted, 'and then the inference follow: in the Greek text the whole 'argument having been stated, the connexion is natural and 'obvious, but here of course it is entirely obscured. So, in 'quoting texts from Scripture, part of a passage will be given, 'and the very clause of it which relates to the point in hand 'omitted.

'To form any conclusion from such a translation as this, 'either as to the original reading of any passage in the Greek 'Constitutions, or as to the ancient doctrine and discipline of 'the Church, must of course be very hazardous.'

Our own examination of this version fully confirms us as to

the general correctness of this view, especially in the point of omissions, of which there are most certain proofs. Whether the passages that are in the Æthiopic and not in the Greek, are additions, is not so clear. They may have been retrenched by the Greek editors out of the earlier text. Indeed, since it is certain, from the citations of S. Epiphanius, that the Greek text has undergone very considerable modifications, it yet remains to be ascertained to what extent the Æthiopic represents an earlier state of the Greek text. A comparison of portions of the Syriac version with the Æthiopic shows that the latter agrees with the Greek in points in which that shows a later condition than the Syriac, as indeed the late period at which the Æthiopians were christianised would imply.

IV. Arabic.—We place the Arabic translations last because they are the most recent, and have probably been themselves made from Oriental versions. Of these there are several extant. Of two in the Bodleian Library a very copious account was given by Grabe. They contain a translation of the thirty canons of which Wansleb has given an account in his history of the Church of Alexandria, part v. chap. 1; of the little tract on the *Duæ Viæ*, which we have already seen in Coptic and Greek, and of the Didascaly, or first six books of the Constitutions. Grabe gives the titles of the chapters of the Didascaly, and compares them with the Greek, and the titles of the Æthiopic. In regard to the latter, as we have said, he is occasionally mistaken, as appears now that we have the text itself. But the result of his examination was, that there had been a considerable difference of arrangement of portions of the Didascalia; besides, there are in the Arabic five chapters which are not in the Greek, which it would appear from the titles of the chapters are also in the Æthiopic. Some extracts are given from these chapters by Grabe, to show (against Whiston) that they taught the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity. The difference of arrangement between the Æthiopic and the Greek has been noticed; but the Arabic differs from both. These ancient books seem to have been treated with very little ceremony by those who took in hand to edit, or re-write, or translate them.

We fully concur in the wish that has been expressed for the publication of the different versions; though we apprehend the treatment of the text has been so free that very little, in a critical point of view, will be gained by it. Still the cause of truth, and our knowledge of what was actually the condition in which these books were when in the hands of the Easterns, will be promoted. That much will be gained for our knowledge of the early or original state of the Greek text, except from the Syriac, we cannot hope.

Having now considered the nature and value of the different texts and versions of these ancient productions that are now known to be extant, we will state the result as regards each several document, the existence of which is indicated by them.

I. The *Duæ Viæ.* This is the tract printed in Greek by Bickell, and extant also in Coptic, Æthiopic, and Arabic; it is that which bears upon the face of it marks of the highest antiquity, and which is preserved to us in the most pure and uncorrupted state. In this respect it is markedly distinguished from all other remains of the same class; for whilst the others appear to have been considered as common property, free to be altered and modified by the will of any one, this tract, as far as we can see, has been retained inviolate; internally there is scarcely a trace of anything in it which has the semblance of an interpolation; and all the versions which we have present it entire, and with few variations beyond those probably arising from mistakes of translators; a circumstance, we conceive, which may be taken as an indication that it was viewed with respect, and regarded as a work of authority. Its antiquity appears from its simplicity: its referring only to the earliest orders of the ministry (for bishops, presbyters, readers,[1] deacons, with widows and women ministering to the poor, alone are mentioned): its absurdities, if viewed critically; and the fact, that, notwithstanding these absurdities, it held a place in these ancient collections of so-called Apostolic documents. Reverence for its antiquity alone could give it this position. The Constitutions show what the works of the third century were in their air of literary pretension and studied rhetorical style. This work belongs to an entirely different class. Now, is this little book the Διδαχὴ τῶν Ἀποστόλων, mentioned by Eusebius, Athanasius, and others? Is it that spurious but pious work which was read amongst Christians in the fourth century, and which had been ordered by the fathers to be used by persons who were disposed to embrace the Christian religion, which is classed with the Shepherd of Hermas, and the Epistle of Barnabas, and the Revelation of Peter? The work certainly corresponds in its substance with these marks. It sets forth a picture of the moral character required in Christians, specially as contrasted with practices which prevailed commonly among the heathen, and were not regarded as sins; and gives rules respecting the ministers of the Churches, which, without exposing Christian doctrines to the scoffing curiosity of Gentiles, would give a convert some notion of the institution into which

[1] The Reader's is the first office that is mentioned besides Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, and that by Tertullian, De Præsc. Hær. ch. 41, cir. 200. But the way in which he mentions the office, as well known, and adopted by heretics ('Alius hodie episcopus, cras alius; hodie diaconus, qui cras lector; hodie presbyter, qui cras laicus'), shows that it was a settled and recognised office.

he was to be admitted. Its apparent antiquity, careful preservation, and this its general character, certainly suggest the possibility of its being the work in question; and there are two further facts which fall in with such a view.

1. In Ruffinus on the Creed, as has been already stated, we find a list of sacred books nearly corresponding to those in Eusebius and Athanasius, whom he appears to have followed; but in the place of 'the Teaching of the Apostles,' we have 'the Book of the Two Ways, or the Judgment of Peter.' From this it would seem to be the same book under another name; we cannot otherwise account for the *Doctrina Apostolorum* being omitted; for, be it observed, he himself found it under that name in translating Eusebius' list, but yet does not mention it here.[1]

It is important to observe further, that the 'Duæ Viæ, or Judgment of Peter,' is never heard of anywhere else: which, if it were a book received and read, as its position in Ruffinus' list implies, is at least very strange, so much so, indeed, that critics have thought that it must be some known apocryphal book or other, under a different name. That it is the Doctrina Apostolorum would, we repeat, be most probable, from its taking the place of that book in Ruffinus' list.

Now the publication of this work may, perhaps, afford the true solution, as it shows that its contents and character are such as might allow of either name. It is, in fact, the teaching or teachings of the Apostles throughout. They are represented as meeting to agree upon instructions to be sent out to all the Churches, and each Apostle contributes his share to the collected Teachings. The word διδαχή, as it is used in the New Testament, refers chiefly, we need scarcely observe, to practical teaching, not to *doctrine*, as we use the word. Therefore we have preferred translating its title, 'The Teaching of the Apostles.'

Again, this title, The Two Ways, or the Judgment of Peter, seems quite as truly to represent the little book; for it begins by a description of 'the two ways' of life and death, in a passage which we shall cite presently; and in three places S. Peter is represented as giving judgment definitively, and we may say authoritatively. It might then equally well be called, 'The Teaching of the Apostles,' or 'The Two Ways, or the Judgment of Peter.' And the concurrent fitness of these three names is an argument of no little weight to show that this is really the book so described.

---

[1] Ruffinus' words, speaking of extra-canonical books, are: 'In Novo Testamento libellus, qui dicitur Pastoris sive Hermetis, qui appellatur Duæ Viæ, vel Judicium Petri; quæ omnia legi quidem in Ecclesiis voluerunt, non tamen proferri ad auctoritatem ex his fidei confirmandam.' We conceive that by the 'qui appellatur,' &c. a distinct work is intended.

Lastly, we have the catalogues of sacred books (given above, p. 275), with the number of lines (*στίχοι*) in each, according to the established mode of stichometrical writing. It is of course a precarious ground of argument, on account of the different lengths of the lines in different books, but the fact falls in with our view. The number of *στίχοι* in the *Διδαχὴ τῶν Ἀποστόλων*, or Doctrina Apostolorum, was 200; the number in the Book of Canticles was 280; now, if this tract, newly printed by Bickell, and the Book of Canticles, were printed in the same type and lines, the number of lines in the former would be 223, of the latter 268. If we allow for the varying lengths of the *στίχοι*, the correspondence may so far confirm the other arguments for the identity of our tract and the *Doctrina Apostolorum* of the ancient Church.

It is true that we do not find in this book the passage cited from the Doctrina Apostolorum, in the pseudo-Cyprian De Aleatoribus; and in none of the texts does it bear the name of *Διδαχὴ τῶν Ἀποστόλων*. These are difficulties, the former of which we must leave as a difficulty, only suggesting that there may have been other forms of the book; and that it may have shared in some Versions the fate of other elementary parts of the Constitutions. As to the title, it is to be remembered that in no case does this work appear as a separate treatise. It is in the Versions the first portion of a collection of 'Apostolic' ordinances, and the title, 'Canons of the Apostles,' is that of the collection considered as a whole.[1] The word *διδαχὴ*, however, is used to express the substance of its contents, as we read, 'Do thou, Peter, utter *τούτων τῶν λόγων τὴν διδαχὴν*,' and the words with which it is introduced as an insertion into the Epistle of S. Barnabas, are, *μεταβώμεν δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ ἑτέραν γνῶσιν καὶ διδαχήν*.

The later Greek canonists have indeed stated one after another that the *Διδαχὴ τῶν Ἀποστόλων*, which Eusebius and Athanasius mention, is the eight books of Constitutions. But this, if it were not on other grounds impossible, would, as Archbishop Ussher long ago observed, be inconsistent with the fact that the *διδαχὴ* was a book suited for the use of new converts; whilst the Constitutions were, as the last Apostolical canon says, not to be read by the unbaptized, because their contents referred to the Christian mysteries; and further, it is inconsistent with the size of the work as described in the stichome-

[1] In the Vienna MS. (see Lambecius, tom. viii. p. 906) it is found amongst the portions of the Hippolytean Collection, which are detached in a different order from that in which they are usually found. The title which it has there is evidently not correct; it is *Αἱ Διαταγαὶ αἱ διὰ Κλήμεντος, καὶ Κανόνες ἐκκλησιαστικοὶ καὶ τῶν ἁγίων Ἀποστόλων*. The name of Clement does not occur in the tract.

tries. The mistake of the canonists probably arose from the circumstance that the greater part of the Constitutions was known as the Διδασκαλία τῶν Ἀποστόλων, as well as from the fact that the practical portions of the διδαχὴ were embodied in the seventh book.

And now of the book itself. It is divided into two portions, the first respecting the lives and conversation of Christians; the second, respecting ecclesiastical officers. The Apostles are represented as in conference agreeing on regulations which they send out to the whole world; each speaks in his turn and suggests some rule. It opens thus:—'We greet you, sons and 'daughters, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ; [we] 'John and Matthew, and Peter and Andrew, and Philip 'and Simon, and James and Nathanael, and Thomas and 'Cephas, and Bartholomew and Jude [the brother of James]. 'We being assembled, according to the command of our Lord 'Jesus Christ, our Saviour, as He enjoined us before: "Ye 'shall divide among you the provinces, make an orderly arrange-'ment of the numbers of places, the dignities of bishops, the 'stations of presbyters, the ministries of deacons, intelligent 'readers, blameless widows, and whatever is necessary for the 'founding of the Church, in order that knowing the model of 'things in heaven, they may guard themselves from all irregu-'larity; knowing that they shall give an account in the great 'day of judgment respecting those things which they have heard 'and have not kept;" and He commanded us to send forth 'these words into all the world. It therefore hath seemed good 'to us, with the view of reminding and admonishing the brethren, 'having His word in remembrance, to enjoin on you, as the 'Lord hath revealed to each of us, according to His will (or 'according to the will of God) through the Holy Ghost.'

'John said, "Brethren, knowing that we shall render an account 'respecting those things which have been enjoined us, let us not 'respect the persons one of another, but if any one think it ex-'pedient to contradict another, let him be contradicted."

'And it seemed good to all that John should speak first:—

'John said, "There are *two ways*, one of life, and one of death; 'and the difference is great between the two ways; for the way 'of life is this: first, thou shalt love God who made thee with 'all thy heart, and shalt glorify Him that redeemed thee from 'death, which is the first commandment; the second, thou shalt 'love thy neighbour as thyself, which is the second command-'ment; on these two hang the whole law and the prophets."'

'Matthew said, "All things which thou wouldest not should done to thee, do not thou to another: but the lesson conned in these words,' (so we understand τούτων δὲ τῶν λόγων

τὴν διδαχὴν,) '"speak thou, brother Peter." Peter said, "Thou 'shalt not kill,"' &c.

Now, before going any further, it will be manifest that this is the production of one who, pious as his whole work is, was a writer of fiction, and a very simple-minded one. The entire composition is of this character. This and the attributing actual words to our Lord, and relating colloquies amongst Apostles, however much it might engage the interest of simple people, make it improbable that this book (which, whether it be the *Doctrina Apostolorum* or not, held the first place in the Oriental Collections of Apostolic Canons) was the authorized composition of one of the great Churches of the primitive ages,—the actual recognised book of laws for daily life and Church government, in such a Church as that of Alexandria. It contains no indication of any rule special to the Church of Alexandria (though most probably it is an Alexandrian composition); indeed it does not seem suited to be the rule-book of a long-settled Church, because the only rule for the election of a Bishop, is that which provides what shall be done when the number of Christians in any place is small, and there are fewer than twelve brethren to vote in the election; and the other rules for the Church officers seem clearly to be designed for a newly-formed Church. It was this tract which, when its dramatic features had been pared away, and the good words put into the Apostles' mouths alone left, was recently put forth in the 'Church-and-House Book,' as containing the first set of Canons of the Alexandrian Church.[1] This notion could not, we think, gain credit if the fictitious narrative portion of the work had not been stripped off; and those characteristics which alone can enable us to decide on the value of the production as a document of the Antenicene Church been in the background. For instance, the list of Apostles shows an ignorance of Holy Scripture which would surprise the very children of our days. The number twelve is made out in the list, but Cephas is introduced as a separate person from Peter, and he and Nathanael occupy the places of S. James the Less and S. Matthias; and this is no mistake in the list only, because each of those who are there enumerated speaks in his turn. One only has no speech assigned him in the Greek, viz. Judas; and his name is also wanting in the Coptic, but it is supplied in the Æthiopic. Again, the following occurs not far from the end: 'John said: "Ye have forgotten, brethren, 'when the Master asked for the bread and the cup, and blessed 'them, saying, 'This is My Body and Blood;' that He did not

[1] Bunsen had the Coptic only when he wrote the portion of his work in which these Canons are introduced, vol. iii. p. 9 and p. 35; he afterwards learnt the existence of Bickell's work.

'permit these women to stand with us." Martha said, "[It was] 'on account of Mary, because He saw her smiling." Mary said, "I 'did not laugh any more; for He said before to us, when He was 'teaching, that the weak shall be saved by the strong."' We can indeed imagine this to be the composition of a simple and good man, putting down, perhaps, some traditional sayings, or the inventions of the writers of spurious gospels. The tales of Papias, and the general style of the very beautiful Shepherd of Hermas, show us what might thus be written. We can further very well imagine that it might be read amongst recent converts, and even in some of the religious meetings of Christians, (which, be it remembered, were then conducted in a very simple way, and often, doubtless, by very simple-minded bishops,) on account of the truly edifying matter which it contains; we can imagine, further, that it might be taken as a good compendium of Christian practice, for the use of catechumens, lent to them probably by their Christian friends; and so we can imagine that it thus gained a hold on the affections of Christians, and that they continued to read it and to love it; but we hold it quite certain that it must have been regarded by the great doctors of the Church of Alexandria in the second century, as it was by Eusebius and Athanasius in after times, as a spurious, unauthoritative book, fit, as Ruffinus says, to be read for edification, but only for that purpose, and not to be regarded as of any authority.

We will not leave this relic of antiquity, without a brief reference to some illustrations of early morals, doctrine, and practice, which are found in it. For instance:—

'Peter says, "Thou shalt not hate any man; but some thou shalt reprove, and some thou shalt pity, and for some thou shalt pray, and some thou shalt love more than thine own soul."

'Thomas said, "My son, him that speaketh to thee the word of God, and has been to thee the cause (*παραίτιος*) of life, and has given to thee the seal in the Lord, thou shalt love as the apple of thine eye, and thou shalt remember him day and night; thou shalt honour him as the Lord, for where the Lord is spoken of, there the Lord is. And thou shalt seek his face daily, and the rest of the saints, in order that thou mayest rest in their words; for, being joined as holy to the holy, thou wilt become holy. Thou shalt honour him, in so far as thou art able, of thy sweat, and of the labours of thy hands; for if the Lord hath vouchsafed that, through him, spiritual meat and drink, and everlasting life, be given to thee, thou oughtest much more to offer him the perishable and temporary food; for the workman is worthy of his hire; and thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn; and no one planteth a vineyard, and eateth not the fruit of it."'

'Cephas said, "Thou shalt not make divisions, but shalt reconcile those 'at are contending; thou shalt judge justly, thou shalt not respect the 'son, when thou reprovest any one for a transgression; for wealth 'ileth not with the Lord, for He prefers not dignities in judging, nor does 'auty profit, but all are equal with Him.

'"In thy prayer be not of doubtful mind whether it shall be or not. Do not stretch out thy hand for receiving and contract it for giving. If thou hast [means], thou shalt give with thy hands as a ransom for thy sins. Thou shalt not hesitate to give, nor murmur in giving; for thou shalt know who is the good Recompenser of thy reward. Thou shalt not turn away from the needy, but shalt share in all things with thy brother, and shalt not say that things are thine own; for if ye are sharers in what is immortal, how much more in things corruptible!"

'Bartholomew said, "We beseech you, brethren, whilst yet there is time, and ye have those among you to whom ye may do good, fail not in anything if ye have opportunity, for the Day of the Lord is near, in which all things shall perish together with the evil; for the Lord shall come, and His reward is with Him. Be ye good counsellors of yourselves, well instructed: thou shalt keep what thou hast received, neither adding nor taking away.'"—P. 120.

Then, after the words of S. Peter and the rest quoted above:—

'Peter said, "If there be a paucity of believers, and there be not in a place persons qualified to vote in the election of a Bishop to the number of at least twelve, let them write to the Churches in the neighbourhood of the place where the Church in question is fixed, in order that three selected men coming thence, may try and approve him that is worthy, if he has a good report from the heathen, if he is unblameable, if a friend of the poor, sober-minded, not a drunkard, not a fornicator, not covetous, or a reviler, or a respecter of persons, and the like to these: it is well that he be unmarried: but if not, the husband of one wife: one that has had training, able to explain the Scripture: but if unlettered, let him be meek: and let him abound in love to all, lest the Bishop should be reproached by the many on any point."

'John said, "The Bishop that has been appointed, knowing the attention and love of God of those that are with him, shall appoint two presbyters, whomsoever he shall approve."

'All answered, "Not two, but three; for there are four-and-twenty elders, twelve on the right, and twelve on the left."

'John said, "Ye have reminded me aright, my brethren; for those on the right receiving the vials[1] from the archangels, offer them to the Lord, and those on the left overlook the multitude of the angels, &c.'"

The simplicity of its teaching is very beautiful. It carries with it the whole air of being written in primitive times, for recent converts, and for a country where the Church was but newly established. There breathes throughout an air of almost apostolic purity and truth. In the whole there is supposed, the doctrines of grace in connexion with the sacramental rites and the Christian ministry; Baptism, the Sealing (of Confirmation), the Oblation of the Body and Blood, (not of the mere elements, *περὶ δὲ τῆς προσφορᾶς τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος ἀκριβῶς μηνύσωμεν,*) and the Communion of them, as giving eternal life; the laity are distinguished in character and office; the distinctness of the clergy and their offices are set forth.

[1] See Rev. v. 8.

We have a picture of Christian life, and morals, and doctrine, such as it was, among simple converts at least, in the age next after the Apostolic.

We must now trace the further history of this little tract. Besides being preserved distinct, so as to be embodied in the Collections of Canons, it underwent a process of adaptation to other uses. Stripped of its dramatic or mythical character, the latter portion, on Church Offices, being also omitted, it was annexed to the Epistle of Barnabas, or rather inserted in it just before the concluding words; we say so, because those concluding words are cited by Clement of Alexandria as out of the Epistle of Barnabas, as well as several portions of the part before the insertion, but no portion of this inserted part itself. The insertion, however, is cited repeatedly by Origen as a part of the Epistle. That it is an insertion, is, we think, plain from the difference of style; these chapters had long been regarded as an interpolation; and we infer that the addition was made, at the latest, between the times of Clement and of Origen—between 190 and 230. From this we infer that the tract itself was much older; and we apprehend that it was thus embodied in another work, in order to preserve the valuable practical teaching to which the Christians had been attached from the time of their conversion, without the fiction of Apostles holding a colloquy together. After this, in the compilation of the eight books of the Constitutions, it was introduced as the beginning of the seventh book, being there, as in the Epistle of Barnabas, without any of its dramatic characteristics. This was its natural position, as the first of the forms of old pseudo-apostolic appointments.

In its original form it might well be called 'The Teaching, or Teachings of the Apostles;' or 'The Two Ways, or the Judgment of Peter;' we submit to the judgment of others, whether the characteristics of the work do not fall in with this supposition. But there is no proof whatever that this tract was regarded as of authority in matters of ecclesiastical rule; and the most cursory examination of its contents shows that it could never have been used to any extent for such a purpose. One-half of it is on practical subjects exclusively; the other half is so to a very great extent. It makes no provision, we repeat, for the election of a Bishop in a settled Church, but only in one where the number of converts fit to join in the election was under twelve; it orders that the Bishop should appoint *three* Presbyters (though the reasons given seem rather to imply that the number should be an equal one), and divides them into two classes, assigning the respective duties of each; it orders the appointment of a reader, who seems to have

been a teacher also, and of Deacons; of three widows, two to be employed in prayers and duties in the Church, one in attending the sick; it sets forth the qualifications to be required for these offices, and the duties of each, in very simple terms; it strictly requires laymen to keep to lay duties, and to submit to the Clergy; it confines women to ministering to the poor. We repeat that the only intelligible account of this tract is, that it was written by a pious and simple-minded person for the use of some newly-formed Churches; that the simple piety of its precepts, and its compendious form, gained it favour, and made it a useful work for the reading of new converts; that its profession of apostolical origin gained it greater reverence amongst the ignorant; whilst the learned severed what was good in its precepts from the fictitious form in which they were expressed, and embodied it in other writings.

II. The so-called Constitutions of Hippolytus.

The next portions of these collections, in point of antiquity—we speak of them, of course, in reference to their primary and original form—are those which bear in the Greek the name of S. Hippolytus; but their fate has been the very opposite to that of the last-mentioned tract. The changes they have undergone, and the various forms in which they appear, and the seeming differences of age, as of style, in their various parts in all the forms and versions, force on us the conclusion that they were originally compacted from several different sources, some collections taking some, others, again, other parts; and afterwards were, for the most part, altered freely by those who copied them, put them into collections, or translated them.

The forms in which we have them are, as we have said, as composing the Eighth Book of the Constitutions; as extant in a separate form in a Greek MS., and printed in the Works of S. Hippolytus; and in the Coptic Collection, with some alterations, and a great dislocation; and, again, with still greater alterations, and the addition of several distinct portions, in that Coptic series which we have marked B.

As we have them in the Greek, they may be divided into these parts:—*a.* Two long chapters of what we have said is a discourse or homily of S. Hippolytus on gifts or offices, and on the worthlessness, and, as he seems to say, the invalidity of Orders without personal holiness. This is what is alleged as an evidence of S. Hippolytus's Novatianizing. Then the connecting chapter referring to the former books; this is in the Greek Constitutions and the Coptic C, in both of which this collection is joined on to others; it is not in the Greek, as it exists as a separate work. These chapters of the supposed S. Hippolytus

are not in the Coptic B, and are evidently distinct from what follows next.

b. This is a collection of prayers and rites to be used in Ordinations for each order or office. Now, in the Greek, each of these is set down as the Constitution of some Apostle; and so, indeed, of the whole, the general title is, Περὶ χειροτονίων διὰ Ἱππολύτου. It begins with an introduction by the Apostles, ending with, 'I Peter enjoin respecting the ordination of us Bishops;' on the ordination of a Presbyter, 'I, the beloved of the Lord, enjoin;' on the ordination of a Deacon, 'I Philip ordain.' In both the forms in Coptic these titles, and all the fiction of Apostles speaking, are wanting; but in the second, which we marked C, there are some appearances which indicate that these fictions formed a part of the original work, from which the translation, or some text of which it was the translation, was made; as, for instance, in the portion which in the Greek is called 'the Constitution of Paul,' we read, 'As we 'have commanded you already (ἐν τοῖς προλαβοῦσι), and have 'taught thus in *the* Epistles;' the Greek is ἐν ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς, that is obviously, 'in *my* Epistles.' It is part of the fiction which put these words in the mouth of S. Paul. The Copt omits the fiction, but retains this allusion to it.

This Coptic form, we apprehend, is later than our Greek form; the other form, which we have marked B, may be prior to it. It has not, indeed, the headings attributing the Constitutions to the respective Apostles. But it is, of course, a fairly open question whether this particular fiction is or is not the original form of the collection. It may have been so, and may have been omitted even in the earlier Coptic form, or the Greek, from which it was translated; or it may have been an addition to the original matter. In the case of the Apostles' Creed, the fiction which assigned each article to its own Apostle, appears later, after S. Augustine; before that, in Ruffinus, all we read is, that the Apostles framed the Creed amongst them before they separated from Jerusalem.

c. After these forms for Ordination, which are found in both the Coptic forms, with much occasional verbal correspondence running through long passages, but with very material variations, there comes in the Greek a collection of Constitutions, which is a separate and distinct collection in a Syriac book of Canons;—i. As to the relative powers of the different orders of the ministry, beginning, 'The Bishop blesses, but is not blessed.' ii. As to first-fruits and *tithes*, and the remainder of what is offered for the Bishop and Clergy. These (i. ii.) are not in B. iii. As to ıe candidates for baptism, of trades and works allowed to Chrisans, and the way of life required in a convert, and of catechisıg. This portion is remarkably simple, and is found in B, the

earlier Coptic form agreeing word for word with the second Coptic and the Greek. iv. On the observance of holy days, of morning and evening prayer in church, and in private, at the hours. On the commemorations of the departed;—these are to be on the third, the seventh (Coptic, and some Greek MSS.), or ninth (text of Constitutions, and Hippolytus); or the fortieth (Coptic), or thirtieth (Greek) day after death, and at the end of the year;—on the sobriety to be observed at the feasts held there; on the conduct of Christians under persecution; and, lastly, on the due subordination of the people to their clergy. The whole of iv. is rhetorical and devoid of the simplicity of the previous portion; some parts of it are like S. Clement's Epistle; the conclusion is eminently ornate. It contains the extraordinary incongruity of making the Apostles appoint the observance of 'the days of the Apostles,' for 'they are they who have been your teachers in Christ,' &c. They appoint the observance of S. Stephen's and other Martyrs' days, of the feasts of Easter, Ascension-day, Whitsunday, the Nativity, the Epiphany, (all belonging to the fourth or fifth century). Instead of iv., the earlier Coptic B pursues the subject of candidates for baptism, their preparation, the rites of Baptism, and of laying on of hands; the Eucharist following on this, and rules for the *ἀγαπαί*, and feasts for widows; and on the offering of first-fruits to the Bishop, with the form of blessing them. Then come what seem like *disjecta membra*, rules for the observance of Easter, the duties of Deacons and Sub-deacons, and times of prayer, where we have the very words of the other form C; of reverence in respect of the Eucharist, of burials, of times of prayer, and attending church for prayer and hearing instruction, and for private prayer at the hours; for the use of the holy Sign. Much of this is florid in style; but it is very beautiful and pious in tone.

The correspondence between the customs described here and those enumerated as instances of traditional practices by Tertullian, *e.g.* in his De Corona, c. 3, is very interesting. They corroborate each other; and it is such instances of undesigned coincidence which form the strongest argument for these Coptic and Hippolytean Canons being true representations, on the whole, of the customs of the Church at the beginning of the third century: we extract some passages, which are recommended by their intrinsic beauty, notwithstanding the awkwardness of the translation, which we transcribe from Dr. Tattam's Version, p. 80, sqq.

'Of the time when it is right to pray.

'And all believers, men and women, when they have risen in the morning from sleep, before they touch any work, let them wash their hands, and they shall pray to God, and thus let them proceed to their works.

'And when it comes to pass that there shall be an exhortation of the Word of God, let every one choose for himself to go to that place, reckoning this in his heart, that he hath heard God speaking in the exhortation; for praying in the church will prevail. For when the darkness of the day is passed by, let the timid reckon that it is a great sin if he go not to the place in which they exhort, and especially he who is able to read. Or when the teacher comes, let not any one of you be last in the church, the place in which they instruct. Then it shall be given to him who speaks, that he shall declare things useful to every one, and thou shalt hear the things thou thinkest not, and thou shalt profit by those things which the Holy Spirit shall give to thee by the exhortation; and thus thy faith shall be established by those things which thou hast heard. And they shall speak to thee again in that place of those things it becomes thee to do in thy house. Therefore, let every one hasten to go into the church, the place where the Holy Spirit stirs up.

'When there is a day in which there is no exhortation, let every one being in his house take a holy book, reading in it sufficiently what appears to him useful.

'And if thou art in thy house, pray at the third hour, blessing God. But if thou art in another place, having opportunity at that time, pray in thy heart to God; for in that hour they saw Christ nailed to the wood. Therefore again, in the old law, it is commanded, that they should put on the shew-bread continually, the type of the body and the blood of Christ. And the slaying of the irrational lamb, this was a type of the perfect Lamb, for the Shepherd is Christ. He again is the Bread which came down from heaven.

'Pray again, likewise, at the sixth hour; for when they crucified Christ on the wood of the cross, that day was divided, and there was great darkness. Wherefore, let them pray at that time with a fervent prayer, helping them[selves] by the voice of him who prayed, causing all creation to be dark, by reason of the unbelief of the Jews.

'Let them pray again a great prayer, and a great praise, at the ninth hour, for thou shalt know, like the souls of the righteous they shall bless the Lord God of truth. He who remembered the holy, sent His Son, who is His Word, to them, who enlightened them.

'For in that hour the side of Christ was pierced with a spear, and blood and water came out; and afterwards it was light the remaining part of the day until the evening. Therefore thou also, if thou hast slept (at that hour), thou shalt remember another day, and make the type of the resurrection.

'Pray again before thou restest thyself upon the bed of thy repose; and if thou hast risen at midnight upon thy bed, wash thy hands and pray; but thou shalt wash thy hands in pure water.

'And if thou hast a wife, pray together with one another. But if she has not yet believed, thou shalt withdraw thyself into a place, and shalt pray alone, and return again to thy place. But thou who art bound in marriage, refrain not from prayer, for you are not defiled. For those who have washed have no need to wash again, for they are purified and are clean.

'And if thou breathest in thy hand, sealing thyself with the vapour which shall come out of thy mouth, thou shalt be all clean to thy foot, for this is the gift of the Holy Spirit. And the drops of water are the baptismal drops coming up from the fountain, that is, the heart of the believer, purifying him who believeth.

'There is a necessity, again, that prayers should be at that hour for the elders; for they who delivered this work to us likewise taught us thus to wash; for in that hour all creation is silent, praising God.

'The stars, the trees, and the waters, are as all the host of Angels, who

stand around, serving with the souls of the just, praising God Almighty at that time. Therefore it becometh believers to pray at that hour.

'The Lord again hath spoken after this manner, witnessing to this, saying, "In the middle of night behold, there was a cry, 'Behold, the bridegroom cometh; come ye out to meet Him.' And He interpreted the word again, saying, 'Watch, therefore, because ye know not the day, neither the hour, when the Son of Man cometh.' Likewise, if thou shalt rise at the time of cock-crowing, pray, because the children of Israel denied Christ at that hour. This we have known who believe on Him by faith, looking for the hope of the day of light for ever, which shall enlighten us for ever in the resurrection of the dead. And all ye believers, if ye fulfil these things and remember that ye teach one another, and instruct the catechumens to perform them, nothing shall try you, and ye shall not mourn for ever. Remember Christ continually, and receive this name at all times, sealing thy forehead in fear, for this is the sign which is known and manifest, and by this the devil is ruined. If thou hast done it in faith, thou art known, not only before men, but by the knowledge which thou hast acquiesced in it, as a sign, because the adversary the devil looks to the power of the heart only; and if he sees the inner man that is rational, sealed within and without with the seal of the word of God, he flees immediately, fleeing from him through the Holy Spirit which is in the man, who hath granted him a place in himself.

'This also Moses the Prophet first taught us by the Passover. And he commanded that they should sprinkle the blood of the lamb which had been killed, upon the lintel and the two door-posts, showing to us the faith which is now in us, which was given to us by the perfect Lamb. If we have sealed with this on our foreheads, with our hands, we shall be delivered from those who wish to destroy us.'

This 'sealing' with the Holy Sign especially brings the words of Tertullian, on the frequent use of it, to our minds.

There is, however, nothing in any of these Hippolytean forms which indicates an earlier origin than perhaps the beginning of the third century, and their alterations, severances, and reunions seem to show that they were treated as in no way sacred or authoritative documents, but as good words, such as any one was at liberty to alter, or to rewrite, or to substitute, or add in them something of his own, or a portion of some other collection.

Most of all is this the case with the Liturgy which is introduced in the Hippolytean forms, not independently, but as part of the form for the Consecration of a Bishop. Thus, in the first Coptic Canons (B) we read: —

'And he who is worthy out of the Bishops, every one standing, putteth his hand upon him whom they have made a Bishop, praying over him.'

In the Æthiopic it goes on, 'after this manner;' and a beautiful prayer follows. That this prayer was originally in the Coptic, would appear from the next Canon on the Ordination of Presbyters: —

'And when the Bishop shall ordain a Presbyter, he shall put his hands on his head, all the Presbyters shall touch him. And let him pray over him according to *the form which we have spoken of concerning the Bishop.*'

The Canon on the Ordination of a Bishop in the Coptic continues to the newly consecrated Bishop's commencing the Eucharistic service with the *Sursum Corda*, and then after the words, 'It is meet and right;' it proceeds, 'And let him pray thus, saying the (prayers) following these according to the form of the 'Holy Communion.' But the form itself is omitted. There is a short and simple form in the Æthiopic; one more large in the Greek of the Hippolytean Canons; the same still more amplified and rhetorical in the Coptic of the same; and again yet more enlarged in the eighth book of the Constitutions; so that we have it in four states. It appears clear that this was not regarded as an authorized form. It does not appear to be the service used by any particular Church, but, so to say, a fictitious or imaginary ritual introduced into a literary production. Even the simple form which is found in the Æthiopic is not a liturgy, nor is it so used in their Church; and, indeed, it is evidently not an entire form, as it omits all *intercessions*, which from the injunctions of S. Paul (1 Tim. ii. 1), and the concordant testimony of antiquity, were an essential part of every Liturgy. Further, as it seems to have been introduced into these Canons only as the form to be used by the newly consecrated Bishop, it is improbable that the writer intentionally omitted much of what was not special to that occasion; and, again, that a prayer of blessing on the people by the Bishop, which is peculiar to this form, belongs to the idea of its being the Eucharist of the newly consecrated Pastor, who then first invokes the Divine benediction on his flock.

That this form was an early Liturgy of the Church of Alexandria is highly improbable, for it would imply that when the Æthiopians were converted in the fourth century, a translation was made for them of an old form which was itself wholly superseded in the Church of Alexandria, and which, as we conceive, appears from the two as placed in parallel columns,[1] was certainly not an early form of the Alexandrian Liturgy.

One sign of the earlier date of part of the Coptic B,[2] appears in a Canon about Confessors, that they need not be ordained for the office of Priest, only for that of Bishop, 'for he hath the honour of priesthood by his confession.' This points to the period when the Confessor was regarded as specially holy, and to the prevalence of a superstitious reverence for those who had suffered for Christ's sake, such as we find in S. Cyprian's time; but the Canon which occupies the corresponding place in the Greek which we have, and the later Coptic,[3] corrects this superstitious error, and seems to have specially designed to correct

[1] See Bunsen's Hippolytus, vol. iv. p. 240. [2] § 34, p. 36. [3] § 68, p. 128.

it. It says that a Confessor *must be ordained*, whether for the office of Bishop, Priest, or Deacon, and anathematizes him if he presumes to seize the dignity without ordination; 'for he is not 'a Confessor, since he has denied the command of Christ, and 'has become "worse than an infidel."'

The Canon, as it is in the earlier Coptic form, also shows indisputably that these Constitutions were local rules, made, we apprehend, among small and obscure bodies of Christians, contradicting the practice of the Catholic Church, and having so little influence, that there is no trace of the practice or superstition in question, of Confessorship conferring the Priesthood, in any ecclesiastical writer whatever; no one notices it even to contradict it. It is only heard of in these Coptic Canons, and in the contradiction and anathema in the later and Greek forms of the collection.

Again, the earlier Coptic says,[1] 'They shall not lay hands on a Sub-deacon.' This is in conformity with what we know of early practice. S. Basil says,[2] 'Sub-deacons did not receive imposition of hands;' a Canon on the 'Fourth Council of Carthage' appoints it so.[3] The Greek of the Hippolytean Collection, and of the Constitutions, orders that they receive imposition of hands; and these have now become the differing rules of West and East. The Greek forms of the Canon are later; at least they prescribe the practice which prevailed later, and which was probably only the peculiar practice of some particular Church in early times. Just as practices once peculiar to Rome herself, have spread over one-half of Christendom. The mention of Sub-deacons at all has been supposed by the Chevalier Bunsen[4] to be an interpolation, because 'the Sub-deacon was unknown before Athanasius in the Eastern Church.' It is true Bingham[5] says that we do not meet with the name of Sub-deacon in the East before Athanasius's time, citing Habertus as his authority. But Habertus says, we do not meet with the *name* before, but we find the *office*, only they are called ὑπήρεται, in the Canons of the Council of Laodicea, A.D. 320. There is no doubt that they were quite a settled order in 320; for those Canons speak of them as of course, as they do of Presbyters and Deacons; and S. Athanasius uses the word quite naturally speaking, of such an one as 'a Sub-deacon.' They were a settled order in Rome and Africa in the days of Cyprian and Cornelius, A.D. 240; and there is no reason whatever to suppose that they did not exist quite as early in the East, only it so happens no one had occasion to men-

[1] § 36, p. 38. [2] Epist. Can. c. 51.
[3] Can. 5. The early Canons in the series correspond in subject matter to the Hippolytean on Ordination.
[4] Vol. ii. p. 311. [5] Book iii. c. 3, and references.

tion them. The Coptic avoided self-contradiction here, by substituting for the words of the Greek Constitution, with which it otherwise agrees, and which here prescribes the imposition of hands, the words,[1] 'And concerning the Sub-deacons, and 'Readers, and Deaconesses, we have before said that it is not 'necessary to ordain them.' This is an insertion of the Coptic, as the reference to what went before in that Collection shows.

A similar change has been made in the Canon for the ordination of a Reader. The first Coptic[2] says, 'The Reader shall be 'appointed. The Bishop shall give him the Book of the Apo-'stles, and shall pray over him, (but) he shall not lay his hand 'upon him.' The second gives the words we have just cited. The Hippolytean Canon, § 11, is to the same effect, saying only *βίβλιον*, instead of the Book of the Apostles (as the Canon of the so-called Fourth Council of Carthage also orders only the delivery of the book); but in the eighth book of the Constitutions we find S. Matthew introduced, enjoining the laying on of hands and prescribed form of prayer. These are indications of the changes made in the Canons; and add to the value of the earliest forms, if they could be recovered or restored.

These most valuable and interesting Canons, the earlier Coptic form, of the Hippolytean Collection, our B, have been regarded as the second series of the Canons of the Church of Alexandria, without other evidence than that they are found in Coptic, and that the fruits to be offered for blessing are such as grow in Egypt; the latter being probably the insertion of the person who put them into Coptic. There is no sign of any special connexion with Alexandria, no signs in any Alexandrian writer of the peculiar practices described.

III. The last element of the Constitutions which we shall notice, is that which forms the principal portion, and is, indeed, the basis of the whole; the Didascaly of the Apostles; the original of the first six books. From this we have in Greek a few short citations in S. Epiphanius, indicating the text as it was received in his time—the Syriac Version, which we hope soon to see printed entire, and which, judging from the specimens in Bickell and Ecchellensis, will give an earlier and purer text than our present Greek—the Æthiopic Version, so far as it was printed by Mr. Platt, which implies a text substantially the same as our Greek, with omissions and additions such as we have described, and Arabic Versions of very much the same character. Of the contents of this work we need not speak; they are well known; have been used, largely and incautiously, as a repertory of

[1] § 67, p. 126. [2] § 35, p. 38.

information as to the practice of the Ante-Nicene Church, which we can depend on only when supported by other authority. The whole has been analysed in Bunsen's Hippolytus (vol. ii.), and an attempt made to discriminate by internal evidence the insertions and enlargements which the original had undergone; the result of which, as the author intimates, would bring us to a text somewhat like that of the Syriac Version. On this point we are not prepared to give any opinion.

The general character and composition of the work, we need not say, impress a reader at once with the view that it is a mere literary composition; the highly rhetorical language—the lengthy quotations of Scripture—the inflated style of word and thought—the amplifications—the large hortatory and sermon-like portions, seem inconsistent with the notion that it was at any early period received as an authoritative representation of the system or regulations of the Church. It bears all the marks of being the production of a florid *littérateur* among the Christians of Asia Minor, who wished to represent his idea of some Church rules, possibly as they existed in his own part of Christendom, and to convey excellent practical thoughts and admonitions in the fictitious form of Constitutions of the Apostles. This work of his has been altered, added to, amplified, and retrenched, by successive hands, and in different portions of the Church. The alterations do not appear generally to have been made with any particular view: names of later Church offices are added, but other offices and gradations of rank which were in full power at the same time as they do not appear; *e.g.* there is, as is well known, no mention of Metropolitans or Patriarchs. There was evidently a wish on the part of the editors to conform the rules in some obvious cases to the practice of the Church, as appears from the alteration of the rule about the observance of Easter after the time of Epiphanius. Some alterations and amplifications were probably made when the whole compilation of the eight books was formed.

It was asserted by the Trullan Council that the collection had been interpolated by heretics, and that it contained marks of Arianism. It is said in opposition to this, and it is true, that many of the expressions are such as would not have been used by later Catholics, but were used innocently before the development of Arianism. On the other hand, it must be considered that we do not find traces of any attempts to conform the doctrinal statements to those of Catholics, when it is almost certain we should have seen them if the later recension had been made by Catholics. The Creed, the Gloria in Excelsis,[1] the Liturgies,

[1] See the *Christian Remembrancer* for Jan. 1853, vol. xxv. p. 256. It ought to have been said that Alcuin attributed this hymn to Hilary. This does not affect the argument.

and other forms, are amplified, new matter inserted, and the old enlarged, but yet the phrases which a Catholic would most naturally have used do not appear; *e. g.* the word ὁμοούσιος does not occur anywhere, and the alterations are in an Arian direction. We can have little doubt that the recension was made by Arianising hands, though there are expressions which strong Arians would not have used, and yet might not have removed from the text in which they found them.

On the whole, it is plain that much more knowledge will be required before we can ascertain the genuine text of the work, if that can ever be done; and so far as appears, the faults, and we may say the follies, of the composer appear to be inherent in the work, and congenital with it. Such are those of making the Apostles, by the hand of Clement, set forth regulations for the Church, as it existed in the third or fourth century, and the exaggerated views which pervade the whole.

Add to this Didascaly an abridged form of the *Duæ Viæ*, and a large collection of prayers, and you have the seventh book; and the Hippolytean Collection make the eighth.

And now to revert to the question originally proposed. In case we are able to recover the original text of the different documents of which we have been speaking, what would be its authority or historical value?

We do not think that any of these writings can be regarded as authoritative collections of regulations, or even as reliable exponents of the Church Rules of the ages in which they were written, in any critical points.

1. We restate the consideration, that we do not find them referred to as such; that, as regards the chief part of the work, there is no citation, or clear reference, or intimation of its existence, prior to the time of Epiphanius; that, as to the little treatise, which *may* be the *Doctrina Apostolorum*, it was only regarded as an edifying tract, not as a code of Church Rules. The Hippolytean Canons, in part, may have existed, but, so far as we have the means of judging, were not regarded as of authority, much less were they the actual law-books of the Church; there is no external evidence whatever to support their claim.

2. There is a very strong presumptive argument against there being any authoritative written collections of Church observances in the early ages, from the silence respecting them, not only in writers generally, but even in those who were treating of points on which a reference to such authentic records of traditions would be both a natural and cogent argument. Especially in two notable places, where the subject of traditional observances, unwritten, *i.e.* not recorded in Holy Scripture, is specifically treated of,—in Tertullian, De Coronâ Militis, c. 3, 4; and S.

Basil, De Spiritu Sancto, c. 27. Both enumerate customs such as we find in the earliest forms and elements of the Constitutions. Neither of these drops a hint of these customs being in any way authentically recorded. They not only speak of them as *unwritten*, which, it may be fairly argued, only means not prescribed in Scripture; but imply, by their silence, that they were not written with authority anywhere.

3. When we look to internal evidence, the structure of these works makes it highly improbable that they were books of authority. It is scarcely to be supposed that the Bishops and Presbyters of Alexandria would have put out their code of Church Rules in a mythical form; it is inconsistent with the forms of all their canons that remain to us. These were always, so far as we know, brief and concise rules. That the *Duæ Viæ*, with all its strange fictions, was anything more originally than the composition of some pious but fanciful writer, who wished to throw the rules for Christian life and Church government into a dramatic form, is difficult to believe.

4. The treatment of the other collections—those which we called the Hippolytean and the Didascaly—by their different editors, seems to imply the same. They appear to have considered it open to any one, on the whole, to modify them as he would. Some portions, indeed, are apparently preserved with care—the rules for catechumens, for instance, and some other parts—but, generally speaking, a comparison of the different versions and forms shows that they were not looked on as authoritative rules would be—sacred and inviolable. In this respect they are remarkably contrasted with the Apostolical Canons. With the exception of four Canons on heretical Baptism, which are not found in the Coptic and Æthiopic, the text of those Canons has been preserved intact, carefully guarded from alteration. The only changes, we believe, are those insertions which were made to give a colour to the fiction of their being set out by the Apostles, probably at a late date, and which may be corrected out of MSS. and versions.[1] The Constitutions, on the contrary, seem to have been regarded as common property. The composition of unknown authors, and originally to a great extent fictions, they have neither been treated with the reverence due to a code of laws in which each word is sacred, nor with the respect that is paid to the acknowledged words of a known writer.

[1] Canon 29, 'As Simon was by *me*, Peter:' the word 'me' is not in the version of Dionysius Exiguus, nor in the Epistle of Tarasius to Adrian. Canon 50, the Latin has, 'The Lord hath declared *unto us*.' Κύριος ἡμῖν in almost all the Greek MSS.; and in Zonaras and Balsamon it is Κύριος, or Κύριος ἡμῶν. Canon 82, 'As *our brother* Onesimus;' and Can. ult., 'The Acts of *us* the Apostles.' The Arabic paraphrase has, 'As Onesimus,' and 'The Acts of the Apostles.' See Beveridge, i. 17. 4. In the last Canon the list of Sacred Books has also been interpolated.

5. It seems a mistake to argue, from our finding any of these sets of Canons in a given language, that they were the Code of Church Law of that country. The notion proceeds on the questionable supposition that they were such at any time, or in any place. But, supposing even that they did originally express the rules and forms of the Church in which they were first composed, it seems almost certain that, before the time when they were translated—say, into Coptic or Æthiopic, they had ceased to be regarded as rules, and had become literary curiosities, or collections for pious reading. Had they been authoritative documents in the fourth century, we must have known it. They were current in the Church, bearing apostolic titles, and were naturally translated by those who wished to provide their countrymen with religious books—very probably the translations were the work of monks, more pious than critical.

They are indeed interesting and valuable relics. The more pure we can make the text, the more nearly we can approximate to the original condition of the composition, the more interesting and valuable they become, because they may contain fragments of real rules; and even when mere fictions, they have an historical use quite independent of their authority. Even the Didascalia, fiction as it is, has some value—so far, at least, as it falls in with the testimony of other writers. The *Duæ Viæ* conveys but little information, but its antiquity makes it more interesting; it seems to bring us almost up to the time of the Apostles. The Hippolytean and the cognate Coptic Collections seem to have the greater value, from the multiplicity of other matter which they contain, from their appearing to be more like authoritative rules than the others, and in some cases to be ancient; but the alteration they have undergone, the appearance of their being local, and (as in the case of Confessorship giving Priesthood) expressing temporary and irregular forms of superstition, take away our confidence in them as expressing recognised doctrine or received practice.

To conclude; one thing is quite certain—Of various ages and from various localities as these Constitutions seem to be, altered and added to by so many hands, they yet throughout present one idea of Christianity, as a sacramental and sacerdotal system. Confessorship, indeed, was thought in some place to supply the want of ordination. Still this very view, rejected as it was by the whole Church, implied that Orders was a great and special gift. Laymen appear, indeed, as teachers, and excellent things are said of their teaching; but it is only as Catechists, instructing those who have not been baptized; an office which all Christians would allow to belong to laymen. Bishops are the

sole ordainers, and, in their having the power of ordination, differ from the Presbyters. The Bishops are elected by their flocks,—lay and cleric,—but are approved by the Bishops of the province, and consecrated by them. They confirm the baptized. Baptism is solemnly administered;—sponsors answer for those who are not of an age to answer for themselves. The holy Eucharist is throughout the Oblation—the Oblation of the Body and Blood of Christ. The Holy Sign is made, and the people are directed how to make it. The dead are remembered in prayer. Fasting is ordered. The great festivals are solemnly observed. The hours of prayer,—night and morning, and the three day hours,—are kept. The religion depicted in them is a practical and a heart-felt religion, whilst it is, and because it is, a sacramental, a ritual, a sacerdotal religion. Whatever be the history of the Constitutions and their portions, whatever else they show, they show that our religion has, in this respect, ever been the same; and that when we come up to the verge of the Apostolic age, and almost within hearing of the Apostles' voices, we find Clergy and Laity, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, ordaining and ordained; Baptism and Confirmation; the sacred Oblation of the Body and Blood of Christ; the participation of it as a means of life; and no trace of the beginning of such a system can be found, except with the Lord and His Apostles.

ART. II.—*Poems.* *By* MATTHEW ARNOLD. A New Edition. Longmans. 1853.

THE appearance of the name of a son of Dr. Arnold on the title-page of a volume of poems, cannot but excite a kindly interest in all those who admired, even when they could not agree with, his well-known father. Our good-will, moreover, is conciliated towards Mr. Arnold himself, by the filial consideration for his father's name which has led him to publish two smaller volumes anonymously, and to reserve the avowal of his own authorship, till success, important in its nature if moderate in amount, had shown that he was not likely to discredit a name which any one might be proud to bear. He is not without grounds for the confidence he appears to have assumed. The volume indeed is open on many points to critical remark; but no one of any poetical feeling can peruse it without recognising in the author the possession of remarkable powers, even where a mistaken theory of poetry has thwarted their development and cramped their exercise. All persons of taste would not agree that it was a volume throughout of remarkable excellence. We should not ourselves be inclined to say so much. But we should think little of the poetical sensibility of any one who could be blind to the loveliness, or deaf to the harmony, of many of the separate poems which it contains.

No young poet, even if his powers are the greatest, can ever shake himself free at first from the influence of his forerunners and contemporaries. Originality of style, at least where the style is good, comes late, and is the result of mature taste and experienced powers. And this is especially true of those greater and more cultivated authors, whose genius is the healthiest, and whose own style ultimately the most original. Penetrated with the beauties of their favourite masters, which none can so thoroughly appreciate as great disciples, the echoes of their predecessors' strains may be caught lingering in their own; and their manner takes the unconscious impress of the models they have so reverently studied and so profoundly admired. Take the early works of Shakspere himself, and see how much of Marlow and of the still older dramatic writers is to be found therein. It is, perhaps, profitless to add examples after an instance so great and so undeniable, yet Spenser, Milton, Wordsworth, Coleridge and Tennyson, in their early works, exhibited traces of the influence of their predecessors in the art. To go further back, the whole range of Latin poets, with (perhaps) scarcely

an exception, in the great bulk of their productions, formed their styles distinctly upon Greek models, which to them were ancient, and occasionally descended to direct verbal imitation. It is not therefore in the way of blame that we note the influence of great masters upon Mr. Arnold's style; but as a mark of his powers being yet immature, and that it is at present impossible to predict with any confidence the position in the poetical commonwealth which he may be hereafter entitled to assume. For at present even the best of his compositions, with perhaps a single exception, are referable to some well-known original, which the cadence of his verses, or the general tone and spirit of his work, whether intentionally or not, at least indisputably, recall. The models are indeed various and good, but the imitation is obvious though successful. Taste, therefore, rather than power, is as yet the characteristic of Mr. Arnold's muse; and he succeeds less in creating a fresh impression upon his readers, than in reminding them of other great writers, and in reproducing the effects which those writers have already succeeded in creating.

Take for instance the following passage from one of his latest poems:—

> 'As when some grey November morn, the files
> In marching order spread of long-neck'd cranes
> Stream over Casbin, and the southern slopes
> Of Elburz, from the Aralian estuaries,
> Or some frore Caspian reed-bed, southward bound
> For the warm Persian sea-board: so they stream'd.
> The Tartars of the Oxus, the king's guard,
> First, with black sheep-skin caps and with long spears;
> Large men, large steeds; who from Bokhara come
> And Khiva, and ferment the milk of mares.
> Next the more temperate Toorkmuns of the South,
> The Tukas, and the lances of Salore,
> And those from Attruck and the Caspian sands;
> Light men and on light steeds, who only drink
> The acrid milk of camels and their wells.'
>
> *Sohrab and Rustum*, p. 11.

This is a direct and very successful imitation of Milton's manner; not only the general air has been cleverly caught, but the very phrases and words are Miltonic. We have no objection to the passage in itself, but we feel that the thing has been done, and better done, before. Equally close and equally successful is the imitation of a different model in the passage we subjoin from an earlier poem on the striking story of Mycerinus, as given in Herodotus:—

> 'Seems it so light a thing then, austere Powers,
> To spurn man's common lure, life's pleasant things
> Seems there no joy in dances crown'd with flowers,
> Love, free to range, and regal banquetings?

Bend ye on these, indeed, an unmoved eye,
Not Gods, but ghosts, in frozen apathy?

'Or is it that some Power, too wise, too strong
Even for yourselves to conquer or beguile,
Whirls earth and heaven and men and gods along,
Like the broad rushing of the insurged Nile?
And the great Powers we serve, themselves may be
Slaves of a tyrannous necessity?

'Or in mid-heaven, perhaps, your golden cars,
Where earthly voice climbs never, wing their flight,
And in wild hunt, through mazy tracts of stars,
Sweep in the sounding stillness of the night?
Or in deaf ease on thrones of dazzling sheen,
Drinking deep draughts of joy, ye dwell serene?

* * * *

'Into the silence of the groves and woods
I will go forth; but something would I say—
Something—yet what I know not; for the gods
The doom they pass revoke not nor delay;
And prayers and gifts and tears are fruitless all,
And the night waxes and the shadows fall.

'Ye men of Egypt, ye have heard your king.
I go and I return not. But the will
Of the great Gods is plain; and ye must bring
Ill deeds, ill passions, zealous to fulfil
Their pleasure, to their feet; and reap their praise,
The praise of Gods, rich boon! and length of days.'

Mycerinus, pp. 55—57.

Who does not recognise in this passage an imitation of the majestic music of Wordsworth's 'Laodamia' by one who has felt the beauty of that poem and has aimed at repeating its effects?

Once more, we find Mr. Arnold struck with the melody of another considerable writer, and accurately reproducing it. The passage we subjoin is from the conclusion of the same poem of 'Mycerinus,' in which, if the rhyme be 'after' Wordsworth, in the blank verse he does homage to Tennyson: —

'There by the river banks he wander'd on
From palm-grove on to palm-grove, happy trees,
Their smooth tops shining sunwards, and beneath
Burying their unsunn'd stems in grass and flowers:
Where in one dream the feverish time of youth
Might fade in slumber, and the feet of Joy
Might wander all day long and never tire:
There came the king holding high feast at morn
Rose-crown'd; and ever when the sun went down
A hundred lamps beam'd in the tranquil gloom,
From tree to tree, all through the twinkling grove,
Revealing all the tumult of the feast,
Flush'd guests, and golden goblets foam'd with wine;
While the deep burnish'd foliage overhead
Splinter'd the silver arrows of the moon.

* * * *

'So six long years he revell'd night and day;
And when the mirth wax'd loudest, with dull sound
Sometimes from the grove's centre echoes came,
To tell his wondering people of their king;
In the still night, across the steaming flats
Mix'd, with the murmur of the moving pile.'

Mycerinus, pp. 58—60.

No reader of *Œnone*, or *Ulysses*, or the *Morte d'Arthur*, can have any doubt as to the original which suggested these very picturesque and harmonious lines. It is the manner of Mr. Tennyson, caught and employed by a man of taste and ability.

We do not desire to pursue Mr. Arnold through the various poems of this volume merely for the purpose of showing the originals to whom he is indebted. But in a right estimate of his powers it ought not to be forgotten that he *is* thus indebted, and indebted even to a greater degree than a careless perusal might perhaps disclose. For not only in such passages as we have quoted is the style and manner of another writer unconsciously caught or directly imitated; but often where the manner is his own, and the treatment appears to be original, we may detect the recollection of some beautiful passage lurking in Mr. Arnold's mind, and forming the theme as it were for a graceful and melodious variation. The following little poem, for instance, is one of the sweetest in Mr. Arnold's whole volume:—

'Yes! in the sea of life enisled,
With echoing straits between us thrown,
Dotting the shoreless watery wild,
We mortal millions live *alone*.
The islands feel the enclasping flow,
And then their endless bounds they know.

'But when the moon their hollows lights,
And they are swept by balms of spring,
And in their glens, on starry nights,
The nightingales divinely sing,
And lovely notes from shore to shore,
Across the sounds and channels pour;

'Oh, then a longing like despair
Is to their farthest caverns sent;
—For surely once, they feel, we were
Parts of a single continent.
Now round us spreads the watery plain,
Oh, might our marges meet again!

'Who order'd that their longing's fire
Should be, as soon as kindled, cool'd?
Who renders vain their deep desire?
A God, a God, their severance ruled;
And bade betwixt their shores to be
The unplumbed, salt, estranging sea.'—Pp. 187, 188.

Beautiful verses indeed. But would they have been written but for the famous passage in *Christabel?*—

'Alas, they had been friends in youth,
But whispering tongues can poison truth;
And constancy dwells in realms above,
And life is thorny, and youth is vain.
And to be wroth with one we love
Doth work like madness in the brain.
And thus it chanced, as I divine,
With Roland and Sir Leoline.
Each spake words of high disdain
And insult to his heart's best brother;
But never either found another,
To keep the hollow heart from paining,
They stood aloof, the scars remaining;
Like cliffs that have been rent asunder,
A dreary sea now flows between;
But neither heat, nor frost, nor thunder,
Shall wholly do away, I ween,
The marks of that which once hath been.'

Here it is not the manner of *Christabel* which is imitated, but the thought of Coleridge, which is suggested by Mr. Arnold's poem. We could not carry on this kind of examination in detail, without occupying a great deal more space than is now at our disposal, for where the likeness is not of style, but of thought, the parallel passages require to be set out at length, and the attention must be drawn to those parts which are intended to be compared. In general, however, we may say that there are but a few of Mr. Arnold's poems which do not inevitably remind us of the works of some former writer, either in their language, or in the thoughts of which their language is the expression. In this, however, Mr. Arnold does not differ from the multitude of young verse-writers, of whose productions 'the public little knows, the publisher too much,' and who, after a certain period of friendly praise and moderate social success, pass to the trunkmakers, and are forgotten. He does differ from them in the quantity of original matter which he blends with, or superadds to the stores of others, and in the fine taste and poetical feeling which all his productions display. He differs from them also in the possession of a wide learning and varied accomplishment, which furnish him with an abundance of allusion, and a fertility of unexpected yet appropriate illustration, no less interesting than delightful. Above all, he stands alone in his sedulous cultivation of the classical writers, as the best sources of poetical inspiration, and the highest teachers of the poetical art. He appears to be a finished scholar, intimately acquainted with the great works of Greece and Rome, and passionately fond of their characteristic beauties. Homer, and the Attic tragedians, especially Sophocles, are however those amongst the classics whom he regards with the deepest veneration; a veneration shown not only by an occasional verse or stanza, but in

elaborate attempts to reproduce their style, in a selection of classical subjects for his own compositions, and a pretty frequent adoption of classical epithets, or epithets formed upon a classical analogy, into all his poems, whether of an antique or modern cast.

Mr. Arnold has not escaped the dangers inevitably attendant on such a course. It is true that he has occasionally transferred to his own poems some of the great qualities which he so admires in his Greek models. The clear descriptive epithets, the simple yet distinct pictures of Greek poetry, are not unfrequently to be found in Mr. Arnold. But his love of the ancients has led him into many a harshness and obscurity, many a bald passage intended to be austere, many a childish one intended to be simple; and has filled his poems with a multitude of affectations quite fatal to the perfect enjoyment of them. A Greek statue is a noble thing, and a portrait of a modern gentleman, by Sir Joshua Reynolds, is a noble thing, and both give pleasure to a cultivated mind; but it is an ignoble thing, and does not give pleasure, to see an Englishman straining after the postures, and attempting to wield the weapons of a Grecian hero, and imagining that he attains the faultless beauty of antique form, because he denudes himself of modern drapery. It is true, that a classical image, a heroic subject, a quaintly translated phrase from a Greek or Latin writer, (*e. g.* 'the ringing plains of windy Troy;' 'this way and that dividing the swift mind,') will, when met with in a modern poem, often from association and from an unexpected and pleasing strangeness, give singular delight to a reader acquainted with the classics. But such arts must be used sparingly, and with the skill and taste of Mr. Tennyson, who perhaps of all great modern writers most frequently employs them, or they degenerate into grotesqueness and affectation, and ceasing to be agreeable, become ridiculous. Mr. Tennyson always takes care that his antique subjects shall be treated in a thoroughly modern fashion, that the mind of the present day shall be distinctly seen moulding ancient stories and associations to its own purposes; but never for a moment striving really to imitate classical authors, or to reproduce classical modes of thought. This blending of antiquity with modernism constitutes the peculiar and unrivalled charm of such pieces as *The Lotos Eaters*, and *Œnone*, and above all, *Ulysses*. Mr. Arnold has much of his art to learn, and a great deal of tact and experience to acquire, before he can safely indulge in so difficult and delicate a style of composition: a style in which even success is hazardous, and failure is fatal.

Mr. Arnold, however, has not been content to allow his

practice to speak for itself, and the faults and beauties of his verses to stand upon their own merits, and to be found out by his readers in the ordinary course. He has been induced to write a Preface, in which he favours us with a theory of poetry, which we take leave to think entirely fallacious and inadequate, based upon untenable assumptions, and conducting us to conclusions which we utterly repudiate. As a general rule, it is a great mistake for a poet to commit himself to a theory of poetry. To theorise on poetry is not his vocation, and it is seldom that he has the intellectual qualities requisite for the work. It may be a fit and interesting subject for the critical faculty to discuss the principles of art, and to endeavour to elicit from great works the laws which guided their construction. But it is the critic, not the artist, who is properly thus employed. In all the highest qualities of his art, a great man seldom works consciously by laws at all. Technical rules of course there must be in all arts, such as the laws of metre, of grammar, or of perspective; and a great artist will know all these, and use them as familiarly as we do our alphabet. But these are not laws of construction or of treatment as applied to the whole work, and the effect of any great effort of genius taken as a whole, arises from no conscious application of definite laws on the part of the artist, but from something indefinable and inexpressible, which distinguishes a great artist, a ποιητής, or creator in any kind, from his fellow-men. No artist worth a straw could tell us how his own great works had been produced. Sir Joshua Reynolds, the foremost artist-critic of modern times, analysed with acuteness, and described with eloquence, styles wholly different from his own. Inimitable and excellent as his own productions are, they are utterly unlike those which it was the chief object of his famous lectures to recommend. Wordsworth, again, wrote a celebrated essay on poetical diction, which contained *a* truth no doubt, but not the whole truth, and of the theory of which all his own finest poems were more or less violations. No compositions can be so flat as those which are made up like a grammatical exercise as definite examples of consciously-applied rules; while at the same time to put forth a poetical theory, especially if it is one which requires considerable power to fulfil it, is to challenge for your poems an unusual severity of critical examination, and to increase the disgrace of failure by having openly proclaimed your own standard of success. Few men's works fulfil the measure of their teaching: and the self-confidence implied in prefixing to a man's poems a kind of lecture on their characteristic excellences, and on the somewhat novel principles of taste, according to which they have been composed, and of which they are put

forward as examples, is not with most readers the safest or best method of insuring for the poems themselves a genial and sympathetic perusal. We come to a poet to be moved or delighted with his strains, and we do not want to be told by him that we must admire his poems, because they are written according to certain true and ancient laws, which it seems have been forgotten by most great modern writers. These very writers, nevertheless, ignorant readers have persisted in admiring for those same qualities which a truer view of the principles of poetry would, we are assured, have shewn to be mere blemishes and mistakes.

Of course, if a poet really happens to be a great critic, and to hit upon a true theory of poetry, there can be no reason why he should not communicate it. But the chances are greatly against his doing so, and we cannot say that we think Mr. Arnold has been lucky enough to form any exception to the ordinary rule. It is not easy, as every one will admit, to lay down with precision the objects, the limits, the elements, or the laws of a thing so wide, so various, so profound as poetry. The attempt to do so has, in all ages, led to profitless discussions; such as, whether satire is poetry, whether this or that writer is a poet; which have ended in nothing but occasionally narrowing the sphere of natural and legitimate admiration and delight, by the imposition of unnatural and arbitrary rules. We are not about to follow examples which we condemn, and to add another instance of failure in the attempt to describe the indefinite, and to place bounds upon the illimitable. From the sublime strains of Hebrew prophets down to the latest and most artificial rhymers of these last ages, there is, amidst the infinite variety of gifts, and diversity of powers, something in common which separates the poet from the mass of his fellow-men, and enables him to impart delight to their minds and gratification to their taste. A great poet, like a great orator or a great philosopher, will undoubtedly do much more than this; a poet, however, differs from them not in the thoughts which he creates, but in the dress wherewith he clothes them. In their appeal to the sense of harmony and beauty which all men possess, in the imaginative and musical vehicle which they employ, Homer and Horace, Anacreon and Virgil, Shakspere and Burns, may be classed together. A theory which rejects Dryden and Pope, nay even the still more technical writers of French literature, such, for instance, as Racine, from the rank of poets, is as unsatisfactory, and as far from meeting all the facts of the case, as one which would throw doubts on Wordsworth, or question the claims of Shelley or of Keats. It is simply idle to say that poetry is this or that, when it really pervades the universe; or to

lay down that this or that is its peculiar province, when there is scarcely a subject or an object which it cannot make its own. It is, as it were, the medium through which the poet sees, and by which he speaks, which colours everything he beholds, and robes in splendour or in beauty every creation of his mind.

We do not pretend to say that this is definite or technical, and we should very much doubt the truth of any statement of the nature and objects of poetry which pretended to be either. But beyond most such statements which we have seen, that of Mr. Arnold appears to be altogether inadequate, and to result in conclusions which the common feeling of mankind will agree to reject with something akin to indignation.

'What,' says Mr. Arnold, 'are the eternal objects of poetry 'among all nations and at all times? They are actions,—human 'actions,—possessing an inherent interest in themselves, and 'which are to be communicated in an interesting manner by 'the art of the poet. Vainly will the latter imagine that he 'has everything in his own power; that he can make an intrin-'sically inferior action equally delightful with a more excellent 'one by his treatment of it: he may, indeed, compel us to 'admire his skill, but his work will possess within itself an 'incurable defect.' He then proceeds to argue that time is unessential, and that a great action of a thousand years ago is more interesting and fitter for poetry than a small one of yesterday. From this he arrives, by a curious sort of logic, at the conclusion that ancient subjects are *in themselves* fitter for poetical handling; and that 'an action of the present day,' to use his words, 'is too near us, too much mixed up with what is acci-'dental and passing, to form a sufficiently grand, detached, and 'self-subsistent object for a tragic poem.' Amongst ancient subjects he classes, as we understand him, such essentially different ones as Macbeth and Œdipus; and by the selection of such examples altogether baffles our best endeavours to comprehend the meaning of his rule. Ancient subjects, however, whatever those may be, are to be preferred, and, as we gather, almost exclusively preferred, to those of modern times. It follows from this, that as human action is the only object of poetry, human action, to admit of proper treatment, should be concerned with grand characters, and far removed from us in point of time; and as the classical writers of Greece and Rome selected antique subjects, and treated them in the grand style, a modern poet should go to them as models, and study them as the true originals of art, whose perfections it is hopeless to surpass, and difficult to rival. No modern writer, however great, no modern subject, however good, is to compare, in Mr. Arnold's view of the poetical art, with Sophocles and Homer, with Dido and Achilles.

Such is the theory, which we have endeavoured fairly to represent, although it suffers much by not being given to the reader in the remarkably choice and vigorous prose of Mr. Arnold himself; nor is there anything in what we may call the positive half of it to which we desire to object. So far forth as Mr. Arnold recommends the study of classical writers, and celebrates the intellectual and moral benefits derivable therefrom; so far as he does justice to their calmness and simplicity, their dignity and pathos, their refined and severe sense of art, we go along with him entirely. We do not doubt the truth of what he says, that 'commerce with the ancients appears to 'produce, in those who constantly practise it, a steadying and 'composing effect upon their judgment, not of literary works 'only, but of men and events in general. They are like 'persons who have had a very weighty and impressive expe-'rience: they are more truly than others under the empire of 'facts, and more independent of the language current among 'those with whom they live.' We subscribe to all this; but we fail to apprehend how it leads to the conclusion that an Englishman should write of Medea or of Empedocles in preference to Mary Queen of Scots or Cromwell; that an English poet's allusions should be to classical events, or to the heroes of the ancient world, his style be formed upon that of writers in a foreign language, and his thoughts moulded upon those of believers in a heathen creed.

We will not waste our space, nor our readers' time, with discussing at length the strictures which Mr. Arnold passes upon all modern writers, including Shakspere. However necessary to his theory, they are so little creditable to his taste, that we cannot help feeling they would hardly have been ventured upon except under the stimulus of thoroughly defending a thesis, which, from the time of Aristotle, has made men intellectually unscrupulous. Even in this portion of his Preface, however, there is much which is sensible and true. He contrasts the simplicity of classical writers with the fussiness of many moderns, who loudly 'talk of their mission, and of interpreting the age, and of the coming poet.' The comparison is fair enough, and doubtless greatly to the disadvantage of our contemporaries. But when Mr. Arnold comes to use it as an argument in support of his theory, the matter changes. Does he suppose that there was no cant in the days of Plato, or that because men now write nonsense in multitudes, therefore Burke and Wordsworth are not fit to rank with the greatest authors of any age or any country? He compares the small men of the present day with the great men of antiquity; and though the victory is easy, the terms of the conflict are manifestly unjust. In our day, as in theirs, the calling of a great poet is not to interpret

an age, but to affect a people; and he would be a bold man who should deny to the great singers of our time an influence as wide and deep as ever was exerted at any period of the world's history by the great masters of their art. He would be a yet bolder, in our judgment, who would place such poems as Wordsworth's 'Triad,' or his famous 'Ode,' such compositions as 'The Cenci,' or 'King Lear,' in point of mere artistic skill, at all below any single composition of the Greek or Roman minds.

But the whole breaks down together as a theory of poetry. It is not by straining after one model or another, nor yet by definite and conscious effort, that great poems are produced. Homer, it has been finely said—

> '*Beheld* the Iliad and the Odyssee
> Rise to the swelling of the voiceful sea;'

and there is so much of gift and inspiration in every great poet, that his best works are written, his greatest efforts achieved, in a simple, half-unconscious fashion, by means often the most homely and ordinary, by appeals to those emotions of the heart which are, indeed, all-powerful, but all-pervading, which all men share in common, and in which one age does not differ from another. Subjects thoroughly known, illustrations universally understood, are perhaps essential to the construction of the greatest poems, certainly to the construction of those which acquire the most enduring fame. Disguised, therefore, in a robe of lofty pretensions and severe requirements, it is, in reality, a low and narrow view of poetic art that would make it serve for the delight and instruction of the rich and highly educated alone, and which would exclude altogether the generality of women from its highest enjoyments. Yet this must be the inevitable result of a theory which proposes to a poet as his best subject a story of classical times, to be treated in a classical style, and adorned with classical illustrations. If the best poetry is not to be understood without a profound acquaintance with, and relish for, the classics, the best poetry is to be written for a hundred or two of the male sex only out of the whole population of a great country. And if it be true that grandiose *human* action is the proper object of poetry, what becomes of Milton, and Spenser, and the Georgics, and Horace, and Lucretius, and Catullus, and Simonides, and Cowper, and Wordsworth, and a list of writers as long as Mr. Arnold's Preface, whom no one ever yet thought of banishing from the catalogue of great poets, and whose works all mankind have agreed to consider as poetry of the highest order?

Mr. Arnold's practice has not at all tended to reconcile us to his theory. Those are by far his best poems in which he has trusted most exclusively to himself, and those portions of his poems the most striking in which he has been contented to be

original and modern. For this reason we cannot, on the whole, admire the long blank-verse poem of *Sohrab and Rustum*, a composition evidently put together upon the theory which we have just been discussing. The story of the Persian Hercules slaying his son in single combat, and the discovery of their relationship after the fatal blow has been given, is, indeed, a very solemn and pathetic subject, and much of Mr. Arnold's poem is written in a strain of deep yet subdued feeling worthy of the occasion. The imitation of Homer and Milton is, however, too palpable throughout; the numerous similes elaborately worked out into distinct pictures, and the minute descriptions, remind us of the former; the language is obviously and intentionally imitated from the latter, as we showed some pages back. If from the style we go to the treatment, we are under some embarrassment from not being sure how much of it is Mr. Arnold's own. The subject itself, it is well known, is from Firdousi. But in the first volume of the *Causeries du Lundi* by Sainte Beuve, there is a review of M. Mohl's translation of Firdousi; and some of the passages given by Sainte Beuve from M. Mohl's version, are simply translated, and very closely translated, by Mr. Arnold. We give one of them, that our readers may judge for themselves:—

> 'O thou young man, the air of heaven is soft,
> And warm, and pleasant; but the grave is cold.
> Heaven's air is better than the cold dead grave.
> Behold me! I am vast, and clad in iron,
> And tried; and I have stood on many a field
> Of blood, and I have fought with many a foe:
> Never was that field lost, or that foe saved.
> O Sohrab, wherefore wilt thou rush on death?
> Be govern'd: quit the Tartar host, and come
> To Iran, and be as my son to me,
> And fight beneath my banner till I die.
> There are no youths in Iran brave as thou.'
>
> *Sohrab and Rustum*, p. 21.

The following is from M. Mohl's version of Firdousi:—

> '"O jeune homme, si tendre!" lui dit-il, "la terre est sèche et froide, l'air est doux et chaud. Je suis vieux; j'ai vu maint champ de bataille, j'ai détruit mainte armée, et je n'ai jamais été battu. Mais j'ai pitié de toi et ne voudrais pas t'arracher la vie. Ne reste pas avec les Turcs; je ne connais personne dans l'Iran qui est des épaules et des bras comme toi."'

Sometimes the translation is literal, as, *e. g.*—

> ——— 'for like the lightning to this field,
> I came, and like the wind I go away;" '—*Ibid.* p. 41.

which is a mere literal rendering of—'Je suis venu comme la foudre, et je m'en vais comme le vent.'

This is not the only passage furnished by the short paper we have referred to which has been similarly transferred, and it at

once leaves us in uncertainty whether the whole work of M. Mohl, which we have never seen, may not have been used throughout, and the study of antiquity carried so far as simply to reproduce an ancient poem as well as an ancient subject. For Mr. Arnold has not thought fit to offer a single syllable of acknowledgment to an author to whom he has been manifestly very largely indebted.

We must not, however, leave *Rustum* without an extract, which, if the language is a little affected, is yet very beautiful:—

> 'As when some hunter in the spring hath found
> A breeding eagle sitting on her nest,
> Upon the craggy isle of a hill lake,
> And pierced her with an arrow as she rose,
> And follow'd her to find her where she fell
> Far off; anon her mate comes winging back
> From hunting, and a great way off descries
> His huddling young left sole; at that he checks
> His pinion, and with short uneasy sweeps
> Circles above his eyrie, with loud screams
> Chiding his mate back to her nest; but she
> Lies dying, with the arrow in her side,
> In some far stony gorge, out of his ken,
> A heap of fluttering feathers; never more
> Shall the lake glass her, flying over it;
> Never the black and dripping precipices
> Echo her stormy scream as she sails by.'—*Ibid.* p. 33.

This certainly is a very noble picture. Our readers will, we are sure, feel also the solemn beauty of this conclusion, reminded perhaps, as we have been throughout the poem, by its similarity to a beautiful composition on the story of Atys and Adrastus in Herodotus, published several years ago by Mr. Faber, under the title of *The Dream of King Crœsus.*

> 'He spoke, and Sohrab smiled on him, and took
> The spear, and drew it from his side, and eased
> His wound's imperious anguish; but the blood
> Came welling from the open gash, and life
> Flow'd with the stream. All down his cold white side
> The crimson torrent pour'd—dim now and soil'd,
> Like the soil'd tissue of white violets,
> Left freshly gather'd on their native bank
> By romping children, whom their nurses call
> From the hot fields at noon; his head droop'd low;
> His limbs grew slack; motionless, white, he lay—
> White with eyes closed; only when heavy gasps,
> Deep heavy gasps, quivering through all his frame,
> Convulsed him back to life, he open'd them,
> And fix'd them feebly on his father's face:
> Till now all strength was ebb'd, and from his limbs
> Unwillingly the spirit fled away,
> Regretting the warm mansion which it left,
> And youth, and bloom, and this delightful world.

'So, on the bloody sand, Sohrab lay dead.
And the great Rustum drew his horseman's cloak
Down o'er his face, and sate by his dead son.
As those black granite pillars, once high rear'd
By Jemshid in Persepolis, to bear
His house, now, mid their broken flights of steps
Lie prone, enormous, down the mountain side—
So in the sand lay Rustum by his son.

'And night came down over the solemn waste,
And the two gazing hosts, and that sole pair,
And darkened all; and a cold fog, with night,
Crept from the Oxus. Soon a hum arose
As of a great assembly loosed, and fires
Began to twinkle through the fog; for now
Both armies moved to camp, and took their meal.
The Persians took it on the open sands,
Southward; the Tartars by the river marge;
And Rustum and his son were left alone.

'But the majestic river floated on,
Out of the mist and hum of that low land,
Into the frosty starlight, and there moved,
Rejoicing, through the hush'd Chorasmian waste
Under the solitary moon: he flow'd
Right for the Polar Star, past Orgunjè,
Brimming, and bright, and large; then sands begin
To hem his watery march, and dam his streams,
And split his currents; that for many a league
The shorn and parcell'd Oxus strains along,
Through beds of sand and matted rushy isles—
Oxus, forgetting the bright speed he had
In his high mountain cradle in Pamere,
A foil'd circuitous wanderer:—till at last
The long'd-for dash of waves is heard, and wide
His luminous home of waters opens, bright
And tranquil, from whose floor the new-bathed stars
Emerge, and shine upon the Aral Sea.'—*Ibid.* pp. 47—50.

We have seen the river objected to as being out of place, and distracting the attention from the action and the persons. We do not think so. Independently of the remarkable power of the passage, as a piece of poetical geography, it seems to carry us out of the blood and sorrow of the terrible story into light and peace, and concludes the poem quietly and sweetly, without an attitude or a peroration. It is the way with many great lyric masters, and has for us an especial charm. Every one knows the quiet conclusion of Horace's noble Ode on the story of Regulus, which we have always thought singularly happy, in spite of much criticism to the contrary:—

'Atqui sciebat quæ sibi barbarus
Tortor pararet: non aliter tamen
Dimovit obstantes propinquos,
Et populum reditus morantem,

'Quam si clientum longa negotia
Dijudicatâ lite relinqueret,
Tendens Venafranos in agros,
Aut Lacedæmonium Tarentum.'

Thus far nothing can be objected on the score of style to Mr. Arnold's imitations of the classical authorities. Nor would it be possible to find a more graceful passage than the following, on a Greek legend from the poem of Empedocles, which poem Mr. Arnold has excluded (except this passage) from the volume before us:—

'Far, far from here
The Adriatic breaks in a warm bay,
Among the green Illyrian hills; and there
The sunshine in the happy glens is fair;
And by the sea and in the brakes
The grass is cool, the sea-side air
Buoyant and fresh, the mountain flowers
As virginal and sweet as ours;
And there, they say, two bright and aged snakes,
Who once were Cadmus and Harmonia,
Bask in the glens or on the warm sea-shore,
In breathless quiet after all their ills.
Nor do they see their country, nor the place
Where the Sphinx lived among the frowning hills;
Nor the unhappy palace of their race;
Nor Thebes, nor the Ismenus any more.

'There those two live far in the Illyrian brakes.
They had staid long enough to see
In Thebes the billow of calamity
Over their own dear children roll'd;
Curse upon curse, pang upon pang,
For years, they sitting helpless in their home,
A grey old man and woman; yet of old
The Gods had to their marriage come,
And at the banquet all the Muses sang.

'Therefore they did not end their days
In sight of blood; but were rapt far away
To where the west wind plays,
And murmurs of the Adriatic come
To those untrodden mountain lawns; and there
Placed safely in changed forms, the pair
Wholly forget their first sad life, and home,
And all that Theban woe, and stray
For ever through the glens, placid and dumb.'—Pp. 61—63.

The poem of *The Forsaken Merman*, however, has much more a character of its own, and though reminding us of Mr. Tennyson, has a sharpness and rapidity which he never gives us. It is the song of a Sea King deserted, together with his children, by his human wife, whom he seeks to regain, but who will not

leave earth and her Christian worship any more. Its singular vigour and sweetness are very striking. The wife has gone away, and the Merman wants her:—

> ' " Children dear, were we long alone?"
> The sea grows stormy, the little ones moan.
> " Long prayers," I said, " in the world they say."
> " Come," I said, and we rose through the surf in the bay.
> We went up the beach by the sandy down,
> Where the sea stocks bloom, to the white-wall'd town,
> Through the narrow paved streets, where all was still,
> To the little grey church on the windy hill.
> From the church came a murmur of folk at their prayers,
> But we stood without in the cold blowing airs.
> We climbed on the graves, on the stones worn with rains,
> And we gazed up the aisle through the small leaded panes.
> She sat by the pillar; we saw her clear:
> " Margaret, hist! come quick, we are here."
> " Dear heart," I said, " we are long alone;
> The sea grows stormy, the little ones moan."
> But ah! she gave me never a look,
> For her eyes were seal'd to the holy book.
> Loud prays the priest; shut stands the door,
> " Come away, children; call no more.
> Come away, come down, call no more." '—P. 164.

The two concluding stanzas are very beautiful:—

> ' Come away, away, children,
> Come, children, come down;
> The hoarse wind blows colder,
> Lights shine in the town—
> She will start from her slumber
> When gusts shake the door,
> She will hear the winds howling,
> Will hear the waves roar.
> We shall see, while above us
> The waves roar and whirl,
> A ceiling of amber,
> A pavement of pearl,
> Singing, " Here came a mortal,
> But faithless was she,
> And alone dwell for ever
> The kings of the sea."
>
> But, children, at midnight
> When soft the winds blow,
> When clear falls the moonlight,
> When spring tides are low;
> When sweet airs come seaward
> From heaths starr'd with broom,
> And high rocks throw mildly
> On the blanch'd sands a gloom;
> Up the still glistening beaches,
> Up the creeks we will hie,
> Over banks of bright sea-weed
> The ebb-tide leaves dry;
> We will gaze from the sand-hills
> At the white sleeping town,
> At the church on the hill-side,
> And then come back down:
> Singing, " There dwells a loved one,
> But cruel is she;
> She left lonely for ever
> The kings of the sea." '—Pp. 167, 168.

Reminding us perhaps a little of Schiller, yet with a character of its own too, is the poem of *The Church of Brou*, in three parts. The first describes the Duke and Duchess, a happy bride and bridegroom, the death of the Duke out hunting, the building of the church and of monuments for herself and her husband by the Duchess, and her death. The second describes the church;

the third, the tomb. The last two parts are lovely, their tender feeling and perfect finish alike admirable. We give the second part:—

'Upon the glistening leaden roof
Of the new pile the sunlight shines,
The stream goes leaping by.
The hills are clothed with pines sun-proof,
Mid bright green fields, below the pines,
Stands the church on high.
What church is this from men aloof?
'T is the Church of Brou.

'At sunrise from their dewy lair,
Crossing the stream the kine are seen
Round the wall to stray;
The churchyard wall that clips the square
Of shaven hill-sward trim and green,
Where last year they lay.
But all things now are order'd fair,
Round the Church of Brou.

'On Sundays, at the matin chime,
The Alpine peasants, two and three,
Climb up here to pray.
Burghers and dames at summer's prime,
Ride out to church from Chambery,
Dight with mantles gay:
But else it is a lonely time,
Round the Church of Brou.

'On Sundays too a priest doth come
From the wall'd town beyond the pass,
Down the mountain way;
And then you hear the organ's hum,
You hear the white-robed priest say mass,
And the people pray:
But else the woods and fields are dumb,
Round the Church of Brou.

'And after church, when mass is done,
The people to the nave repair,
Round the tomb to stray,
And marvel at the forms of stone,
And praise the chisell'd broideries rare;
Then they drop away.
The Princely Pair are left alone
In the Church of Brou.'—Pp. 147—149.

But of all Mr. Arnold's poems, our favourite by far is *Tristram and Iseult*, the most original and picturesque of all his compositions, bearing more than any of them the marks of a distinct and individual style. The ordinary story of Tristram and Iseult of Ireland is well known. In this poem we are introduced to the less familiar Iseult of Brittany, whom he

married, and by whom he had two children, loving all the while the elder Iseult. He is dying, and his gentle wife watches him; a messenger has been sent to the other Iseult, who arrives in time to die with him; the wife living on with her children a plaintive sort of life, which is beautifully told in the conclusion of the poem. The different metres, some of them difficult and peculiar, are exquisitely managed; and the feeling which we might be tempted to have, as to the morality of centering so much of interest upon lawless love, must, we are sorry to say, be excited by the original romances in which sins of this kind seem to be considered as taking but little from the standard of chivalrous or even religious perfection. It is curious to observe, in so religious a book as the *Morte D'Arthur*, and still more in other books of the same class, how lax in this respect was the morality of knighthood, and how venial such offences were deemed by those who lived virtuously themselves. We must append a passage to justify our encomium; a passage of almost perfect beauty:—

'But they sleep in shelter'd rest,
Like helpless birds in the warm nest,
On the castle's southern side;
When feebly comes the mournful roar
Of buffeting wind and surging tide,
Through many a room and corridor.
Full on their window the moon's ray
Makes their chamber as bright as day;
It shines upon the blank white walls,
And on the snowy pillow falls,
And on two angel heads doth play,
Turn'd to each other:—the eyes closed—
The lashes on the cheeks reposed.
Round each sweet brow the cap close-set,
Hardly lets peep the golden hair;
Through the soft open lips the air
Scarcely moves the coverlet.
One little wandering arm is thrown
At random on the counterpane,
And often the fingers close in haste,
As if their baby owner chased
The butterflies again.
This stir they have, and this alone;
But else, they are so still.
Ah, tired madcaps, you lie still;
But were you at the window now,
To look forth on the fairy sight
Of your illumined haunts by night;
To see the park glades where you play,
Far lovelier than they are by day;
To see the sparkle on the eaves,
And upon every giant bough,
Of those old oaks, whose wet red leaves
Are jewell'd with bright drops of rain—

How would your voices run again!
And far beyond the sparkling trees
Of the castle park one sees
The bare heaths spreading, clear as day,
Moor beyond moor, far, far, away,
Into the heart of Brittany.
And here and there, lock'd by the land,
Long inlets of smooth glittering sea,
And many a stretch of watery sand,
All shining in the white moonbeams,
But you see fairer in your dreams.'

Tristram and Iseult, pp. 110—112.

One final passage, to show Mr. Arnold's mastery over a common yet very difficult metre. It is the conclusion of the whole poem, the story which Iseult tells her children, walking with them along the heaths of the coast of Brittany:—

'In these lone sylvan glades that April day—
This tale of Merlin and the lovely fay
Was the one Iseult chose, and she brought clear
Before the children's fancy him and her.

'Blowing between the stems the forest air
Had loosen'd the brown curls of Vivian's hair,
Which play'd on her flush'd cheek, and her blue eyes
Sparkled with mocking glee and exercise.
Her palfrey's flanks were mired and bathed in sweat,
For they had travell'd far and not stopp'd yet.
A briar in that tangled wilderness
Had scored her white right hand, which she allows
To rest ungloved on her green riding-dress;
The other warded off the drooping boughs.
But still she chatted on, with her blue eyes
Fix'd full on Merlin's face, her stately prize:
Her 'haviour had the morning's fresh clear grace,
The spirit of the woods was in her face;
She look'd so witching fair, that learned wight
Forgot his craft, and his best wits took flight,
And he grew fond and eager to obey
His mistress, use her empire as she may.

'They came to where the brushwood ceased, and day
Peer'd twixt the stems; and the ground broke away
In a sloped sward down to a brawling brook,
And up as high as where they stood to look
On the brook's further side was clear; but then
The underwood and trees began again.
This open glen was studded thick with thorns
Then white with blossom; and you saw the horns,
Through the green fern, of the shy fallow deer,
Which come at noon down to the water here.
You saw the bright-eyed squirrels dart along
Under the thorns on the greensward; and strong
The blackbird whistled from the dingles near.
And the light chipping of the woodpecker
Rang lonelily and sharp: the sky was fair,
And a fresh breath of spring stirr'd everywhere.
Merlin and Vivian stopp'd on the slope's brow
To gaze on the green sea of leaf and bough

Which glistering lay all round them, lone and mild,
As to itself the quiet forest smiled.
Upon the brow-top grew a thorn; and here
The grass was dry and moss'd, and you saw clear
Across the hollow: white anemones
Starr'd the cool turf, and clumps of primroses
Ran out from the dark underwood behind.
No fairer resting-place a man could find.
"Here let us halt," said Merlin then; and she
Nodded, and tied her palfrey to a tree.

'They sate then down together, and a sleep
Fell upon Merlin, more like death, so deep.
Her finger on her lips, then Vivian rose,
And from her brown-lock'd head the wimple throws,
And takes it in her hand, and waves it over
The blossom'd thorn-tree and her sleeping lover.
Nine times she waved the fluttering wimple round,
And made a little plot of magic ground.
And in that daisied circle, as men say,
Is Merlin prisoner till the judgment-day,
But she herself, whither she will can rove,
For she was passing weary of his love.'—*Ibid.* pp. 132—135.

It will be seen, that in all these passages there is but little of the ancients; that the beauty, great as it is, is of a thoroughly modern cast; and farther, that the man who composed them, is undoubtedly capable, if he does justice to his genius, and is not led astray by any false or affected theory of art, of taking a high rank among modern poets. We do not mean to say, that the whole volume can be judged of by the extracts we have given. There are a number of rhymeless lyrics which are mere prose, printed in varying-sized lines; and a whole poem called *The Strayed Reveller*, written in imitation of the Greek, which is about as like an ode of Pindar, or a chorus of Æschylus or Sophocles, as the banquet after the manner of the ancients in *Peregrine Pickle*, was an adequate representation of Lucullus's supper in the Hall of Apollo. Mr. Arnold will drop these disagreeable eccentricities from succeeding editions of his poems, as he has already excluded several earlier compositions from this volume, to its great and decided benefit. It would be well if he carried the process of weeding still farther, and as he has dropped Empedocles, would drop sundry other moral and quasi-religious musings, which are very painful if they represent the author's real opinions, and hardly ought to be published if they do not.

Any student of Mr. Arnold's poems can hardly fail to be struck with the genuine love of nature, and the accurate and picturesque delineation of its beauties, which the best of them contain. All her aspects are familiar to him, and have been comprehended by him. But they seem to teach him nothing. The beauties which he sees begin and end in themselves.

There is no reference to the hand that made them, no intimation of those lessons which they were appointed to convey. In the many melancholy and pathetic passages in which natural images are introduced, there is no suggestion of the comfort to be derived from them, no such use of them as Scripture and great Christian poets have abundantly sanctioned. It has been nobly said by one of them, that the purpose of the glories of the heavens is to remind man of his appointed home:—

> 'Radiantia sidera cœli,
> Quæ semper, veluti stellata aulæa, micanti
> Lumine nunc nostris oculis prætenta refulgent;
> Ut curvas ad terram animas, moribundaque vota
> Sectantes, Patris oblitas, patriæque supernæ
> Perpetuâ invitent æterna ad gaudia luce.'
>
> J. F. PICUS DE MIRANDOLA, *Excitatio de Somno, sub fin.*

Such feelings find no answering voice in Mr. Arnold's Muse. His descriptions of nature are like those of Keats and Shelley, full of loveliness, but devoid of soul. With another writer it might perhaps not be unreasonable to imagine that he had of set purpose restrained a natural impulse, from a manly repugnance to join in a practice which the mawkish imitations of Cowper and Wordsworth are fast rendering a merely sentimental and insincere fashion. In him, however, it is clearly part of a system of writing which deliberately rejects all such considerations, either as inartistic or as untrue. It is not from a dislike of pretended sentiment, but from a repugnance to the sentiment itself, that he never connects nature with her Creator and her God.

In Mr. Arnold's earlier volumes, the unsatisfactory and depressing tone of his writing was more conspicuous, and consequently more disagreeable, than in this. Many of the more gloomy and desponding poems are rejected from this collection; and we would fain hope that those which are preserved will in process of time disappear in like manner. But enough remains to render the volume a really painful one to those who do not think the destiny or the duty of man a doubtful question; and who feel, as we feel, the incalculable mischief of a sceptical and irreligious train of thought when presented to the mind in melodious verse, and clothed with the graces of a refined and scholarlike diction. Mr. Arnold, for instance, is asked, 'Who prop in these bad days his mind?' and he answers in a sonnet, that he finds consolation for his spiritual doubts and moral questionings in Homer, Sophocles, and Epictetus. In another sonnet he extravagantly eulogises Mr. Emerson, and appears to think highly of religious isolation. Elsewhere he speaks of our '*sick fatigue and languid doubt*,' of our '*casual creeds*,' and of how we pine,

> 'And wish the long unhappy dream would end,
> And wave all claim to bliss, and try to bear,
> With close-lipp'd Patience for our only friend,
> Sad Patience, too near neighbour to Despair.'—P. 212.

And he has selected as a motto to his whole book, a beautiful fragment of Chœrilus of Samos, the utterance of a repining and weary soul, coming naturally enough from a Greek in the train of Lysander, at the close of the Peloponnesian war, but not the key-note we should have desired for the songs of a Christian Englishman at the present day.

The prevalence of a literature, the writers of which appear to think themselves justified in standing *ab extrà* to Christianity, is one of the most difficult and dangerous intellectual problems with which we have to deal. It is not easy to comprehend the state of mind in which a believer can feel secure in taking up such a position. So it is, however; and for the most part these writers adopt one of two modes of dealing with religion. Sometimes they patronise the Christian revelation, point out its philosophical coherence, translate its dogmas into popular phraseology, get rid of some of its stern precepts as a little out of date, and produce it to the world as really after all a very reasonable scheme, by no means objectionable, when rightly understood, and when modified by the intelligence of the nineteenth century. Sometimes they simply pass it by on the other side. They leave it out, observe a perfect silence on the subject, and discuss questions, which, if it be true, it has for ever settled, as if they were open questions, and admitted of discussion. It may be true, apparently, or it may not; but it would excite prejudice to discuss such a point as this, and meanwhile the sensible man will go on exactly as if it were not true. Then we have the influence of nature, the cultivation of art, a right understanding of the dignity of man, the arguments of philosophers upon the nature of the soul, put forward as the means by which poor human kind can be regenerated, and the life of man rounded to that complete and perfect whole of temperate and satisfactory enjoyment, which in this philosophy is the very highest object we can attain.

Any one, however slightly acquainted with the literature, especially the poetical literature, of the day, cannot fail to have been struck with the fact we have described. It is perhaps hard to say which of the two methods of handling religion is the more offensive; but it is not the offensiveness, so much as the practical mischief which results from them, which makes it necessary to notice them. We live in an age, not infidel indeed in profession, not without its strong religious feeling, and great religious works, yet penetrated, especially amongst the more highly educated classes, with an infidel and worldly spirit, which

often employs those who are by no means infidels as allies in its assaults on the fortress of religion. The strongholds of Christianity are no longer beleaguered by open enemies, and exposed to unconcealed attacks. The method now is to sap their foundations in time of peace, and gain entrance among the unsuspicious garrison, in the guise of friends. And many an unwary and careless person suffers himself to be betrayed by fashion into proceedings really hurtful to the truth, which he never would adopt if he clearly saw the full consequences of what he does. These are, indeed, days of doubt and pain, when the dangers of society and the temptations of individuals multiply day by day. 'The armies of the homeless and unfed,' of whom Mr. Arnold speaks, may any day be upon us, brutalized by the physical and social depravity in which they have been permitted to welter, trained on an openly profligate and infidel literature which circulates amongst them by millions of copies, and ready, in course of years, for any savage and fierce excesses which their excited and degraded natures may suggest. It is not for us to blame or to condemn them. To a great extent we have made them what they are. But if anything is to be done it must be done by Christianity alone, by Christian institutions, Christian charity, Christian self-devotion. A lazy philosophical literature, which looks at these things as curious social problems, and proposes to meet the world's wickedness with the precepts of Epictetus, must, if possible, be disdainfully swept away as an incumbrance and obstruction in the path of those who are going forth in God's name to fight the battles of Our Lord.

We must sincerely apologize to Mr. Arnold for seeming to include him personally in the scope of these remarks. We have no reason to believe, and we do not, in fact, believe that, except as a writer, he is obnoxious to them. Indeed, upon him, in his individual relations, it would be impertinence to observe; and we make this disclaimer in truth and sincerity, only lest our words should be taken by others in a sense they were never meant to bear. As an author, however, we conceive him to be open on this score to great and grave objection. It may be, it very likely is, that according to his theory of art, and along with his study of the antique, this is the attitude which he deems it fitting that a poet should assume towards the Gospel scheme; this the sort of counsel he should give to a baptized people. Poetry, perhaps, is to be high, distant, and apart from the turmoil of sinful life, and the everlasting conflict of Our Lord with Satan. We do not the least agree with him. To us this sort of feeling appears to be as bad in art as it is mischievous to religion and to truth. The art that has no relevancy to actual life, that passes by God's truth and the facts of man's nature as

if they had no existence, the art that does not seek to ennoble and purify and help us in our life-long struggle with sin and evil, however beautiful, however outwardly serene and majestic, is false, and poor, and contemptible. It is not worth the serious attention of a man in earnest. All noble and true and manly art is concerned with God's glory and man's true benefit; and we do not believe that the grave and severe artists of Mr. Arnold's favourite Greece, if they had known of the Christian revelation, and if they had believed that in it God had spoken to mankind, would have passed it by in silence and neglect, and attempted to feed the yearning hearts of their countrymen upon the miserable dregs of some Egyptian superstition, or the more refined and intellectual mistakes of the Magian philosophy. If they had known where the problem of man's existence was solved for ever, and where the guide of man's conduct was infallibly to be found, they would have led their disciples to those glorious sources, and have raised their own loftiest strains to celebrate the virtues of the River of Life.

ART. III.—1. *Histoire Critique et Religieuse de Notre Dame de Lorette. Par* A. B. CAILLAU. *Prêtre de la Société de la Miséricorde, &c.* Paris: De A. Vaton. 1843.

2. *Instructions Historiques, Dogmatiques, et Morales, sur les Principales Fêtes de l'Eglise. Par un Directeur de Seminaire.* Nouvelle Edition. 3 vols. Paris: Jacques Lecoffre & Cie. Libraires. 1850.

3. *Histoire Universelle de l'Eglise Catholique. Par l'Abbé* ROHRBACHER. 2me Edition. Tom. xixme. Paris: Gaume Frères. 1851.

4. *Voyage Religieux en Orient. Par M. l'Abbé* J. H. MICHON. Tom. iie. Comon, Libraire. Paris. 1853.

IT is a remarkable characteristic of the Roman Church, that the piety of her members, for the most part, appears to be regulated in proportion to their implicit faith in her system. It is hard to find a saintly person amongst Roman Catholics who does not go the whole length of believing all that may be religiously believed, and of practising all that may be devoutly practised in his communion. For high aspirants, there would seem to be no midway course. Talk of not praying to the saints habitually, of not venerating relics habitually, of not accepting miracles habitually, of not profiting by indulgences habitually, (for we are continually reminded that many of these things are not obligatory,) in the Roman communion! why nothing of the kind appears practically to be possible—possible, that is, to those whose desire it is to make progress in holiness, and self-denial, and active charity. Wherever one or other of these distinctive peculiarities is coldly received, impartially criticised, or sparingly used, there we may be sure to find lukewarmness in devotion, and a lower standard in practice.

We have often tried to account for this singular phenomenon satisfactorily, and it has eluded our grasp. We have appealed to Plato and to Aristotle—those profound alchemists in all that concerns the natural man—for elucidation of the principle, but in vain. It is not clearly the identity between the good man and the good citizen, upon which these philosophers dwell with so much satisfaction in their ideal republics. With them constitutional government is a mean, and virtue is a mean of the same

kind. The laws of constitutional government are of necessity such as have a tendency—a direct and natural tendency—to promote virtue in the individual; and the practice of virtue by the individual has a tendency, no less direct and natural, to perpetuate constitutional government. Nobody can be called a good citizen who does not contribute to the stability of the government under which he lives. Accordingly, there are cases where a person may be a perfectly good man, but a bad citizen. It is far otherwise, they triumphantly point out, in a constitutional government; for there, in order to be a good citizen, one is first constrained to be a good man.

Is, then, Rome the Utopia of which they dreamt, and her children the model men of their aspirations? But for stern facts, to which we shall appeal presently, we might be inclined to think so; for, assuredly, nothing can be more demonstrable from facts on the other side, than that, in order to live and die a saint in the Roman Church, one is almost necessitated to be what is popularly called a 'good Catholic.'

Stern facts, we repeat, unfortunately show that, in order to be a good Catholic, it is not indispensable that one should begin by being a good man: that there have been thousands who have done good service to the Church to which they belonged, by means wholly unsanctioned by the law of Christ: that the terms, good Catholic and good Christian, are neither coextensive nor synonymous. Roman Catholicism is a system in which politics are inculcated before ethics—obedience to the hierarchy before obedience to Christ—the creed of Pius IV. before that of the Apostles. How individuals behave themselves is of secondary consideration, while they continue unshaken in their allegiance to the body politic. Good Catholics, therefore, in the popular sense of the term, are sometimes neither good Christians nor good men,—and it is easy to see why. But how is it that the holier persons are in the Roman communion, the more certain they are to be good Catholics? It is almost the exact opposite coincidence to that which is to be noticed amongst ourselves; for nobody ever heard of a good Anglican that was not a good Christian—was not a good man in every moral sense of the term. But, on the other hand, how many good men—good Christians—are there, and have been always, in the English Church, of whom it could never be said that they were good Anglicans! Is it that latitude of belief and practice is the law upon which we go—strictness and uniformity their law; liberty of conscience our cardinal principle—their centre authority; our Christianity a natural production—their Christianity a forced exotic? Why is it that the best men in the Roman Church are those who cleave most, in principle and practice, to the peculiarities

and even the errors of the Roman Church? Were there some sanctifying influence inherent in these distinctive peculiarities, then all who are good Catholics would be good men! Were they of the essence of the Gospel, then none but good Catholics would be good Christians! How is it that the holiest and devoted persons, men and women, in the Roman Church, are almost invariably good Catholics; and yet that not all good Catholics are good men; and yet that there are many good Christians who are not only not good Catholics, but who do not even communicate with Rome?

All these phenomena are rife in the world; and it would be just as unfair to deny one set of them as the other. In the present instance, it is only the first of them with which we are immediately concerned: the fact that almost all saintly persons in the Roman Church are found, upon examination, to be good Catholics,—that the moment they cease to be the latter, they fall off in a greater or less degree proportionably from being the former. We have but one solution of this enigma that we can submit with any confidence to our readers; and it is quite possible that they may be of opinion that it does not cover the whole of the case. It is, however, this,—that it is by unreserved submission to authority that persons find their well-being in the Roman Church. They find that implicit obedience makes them holier, more docile, more distrustful of their own powers, less self-possessed. They find that the least tendency to examine for themselves, to criticise, qualify, reject, acts *there* like a blight upon their inner life. They grow cold in their faith, measured in their devotions and religious fervour, without confidence in their system. They feel and act as individuals, rather than as dependent members of a confederation. Their sympathies are with Protestants, while their nominal existence is with autocratic Rome. Every time they criticise what is allowed, or dispute what is taught, or doubt what is believed, even though it be only popularly, they feel a disposition to rebel against authority; and the first moment that faith wavers, love cools.

Whatever merit there may be in criticism,—however necessary the task may be in a system so overgrown and overburdened as the Church of Rome,—it would seem that the temper of mind which it engenders *there* is unfavourable to religious progress, and that those who feel themselves called upon to give themselves up to it, by giving themselves up to it, endanger their [illegible]ward peace.

[illegible] is this instinctive presentiment that, consciously or uncon[illegible]isly, sways devout individuals in the Church of Rome. [illegible] authority which is set over them is felt by them to be a

living authority, and one that claims to be exempt from error. Her infallibility upon all points connected with religion is with them a fundamental axiom. Either they have been indoctrinated with it from their earliest years, or else it is precisely the very one to which they pledged themselves above all others when received within her pale. They have admitted it as a first principle,—why should they perplex themselves about details? Nothing that is injurious to faith or morals would have been countenanced, nothing encouraged, that had not a direct tendency to edify. Are not particulars, to use the words of a great philosopher, endless? And, even where principles are disputed, may we not assume that to be the safer side, in favour of which ecclesiastical authorities preponderate? We have abundance of responsibilities, as individuals,—why should we add to them? why meddle with questions gratuitously, the solution of which, we are aware beforehand, belongs more properly to our spiritual guides? Doubtless we may be told to beware that we do not pledge our faith to what may prove to be false through our supineness; but are we not equally bound to see that we do not reject what may prove to be true through excessive criticism? Where the choice lies between habits of trustfulness or of scepticism, can it be questioned which alternative will be accepted by a religious mind?

It is thus that devout persons argue in the Roman communion. It is in fact the only one compatible with the genius of the system under which they live; which is moreover the only medium through which it should be regarded in forming our estimate. It would be absurd to expect that English habits of thought and action would sit well upon one who lived under Russian rule; or that French habits of thought and action would be the *beau-ideal* of citizenship in the United States. It would be absurd, too, possibly, to maintain that the implicit trust with which a devout Roman Catholic is accustomed to repose in all that is practically taught or allowed in his infallible church would be natural or consistent conduct in a member of the Church of England; a body, be it said without disparagement, in which authority speaks out so rarely, and in which individuals are left comparatively so free. Because intelligence may be a duty on the part of members of the Church of England, it will not follow that implicit obedience is not the secret of good citizenship in the Church of Rome. May it not be rather that we have penetrated to the hidden fountain of excellence, the source of spiritual perfection, the true light of the soul, behind clouds and shadows, the germ of every development of the interior life, of which specimens are to be met with in the Roman Church? Can this be the charm that lurks beneath prayers to the saints, adoration of

the cross and crucifix, veneration of relics, ecclesiastical indulgences, and the like? Competent authority has sanctioned them, and the faithful have recourse to them in all dutifulness: their superiors have attributed virtue to them, and they themselves grow holier in their full observance. Would there have been any benefit derived from them had not the Church set her seal upon them, or did individuals look upon their observance as a matter in which they were free to please themselves? There are individuals in the Roman Church who thus look upon them; but, whether in consequence or not, they are certainly none of the holiest. There are Saints, as S. Cyprian and S. Athanasius, who never practised them; but let a Roman Catholic be asked to explain the anomaly, and he would answer, because the Church had not, as yet, authorized them. What explanation, too, is to be given on the passive side? Do Roman Catholics consider the withdrawal of the cup from the laity, clerical celibacy, or a Latin liturgy, to be things in themselves desirable, or what they themselves individually could have wished? Are they persuaded individually of the soundness of the doctrine which accords to the Pope direct supremacy in things temporal? Have they examined historically every ecclesiastical miracle in which they are nevertheless in the habit of professing their implicit belief? It is easy to anticipate what answer (it is, in fact, the only one possible under the circumstances) would be made to these interrogatories; and from these considerations taken conjointly it will have been somewhat explained how it is that, *out of the Roman Church,* a high state of Christian perfection is not unfrequently realized by those who believe and practise nothing that is not plainly set forth in the Word of God; while, on the other hand, there are few really devout Christians to be met with *in* the Church of Rome, who are not likewise, in the strictest sense, good Catholics.

The amount of responsibility which, by the latter fact, if it be true (and we believe it to be most true), rests with the supreme rulers of the Church of Rome, who will determine? The more we admire the children, the more regret we feel that they have not a better mother. What writer upon morals was ever more popular with the authorities of the infallible Church in the present day than S. Alfonso? What system of casuistry ever supplied practical conclusions more repugnant to truthfulness and plain honesty than his?[1] Encouraged as is devotion to the house of Loretto by the sovereign Pontiffs, how

[1] *Vide* Christian Remembrancer, No. lxxxiii., Art. II. (January, 1854.) The devotional works of S. Alfonso are so beautiful, that persons are little disposed to criticise his casuistry; but are his devotional works altogether unexceptionable?

can it be possible for a good Catholic to doubt a story, which, for gross falsehood and effrontery, stands unrivalled even among monkish legends?

We have prefaced our inquiry into the historical evidence for the Santa Casa with these remarks, partly by way of apology to our readers for entering upon such a subject at all, and partly to account for the strange paradox which inquiry has forced upon our attention. We have, in truth, made a twofold discovery: first, we have discovered, for our own satisfaction in the matter, that history supplies a more complete annihilation of the legend than we had ever dreamed; but then, on the other hand, we have discovered also that belief and disbelief in the story (false as it is) amongst Roman Catholics go hand in hand respectively with ardent piety and indifferentism. Who would have believed that piety was compatible with sincere (we do not say wilful) belief in a lie? Yet so it is. May it not well be, therefore, that piety is likewise fostered by devotional practices in themselves equally fond and shadowy, when it is in a spirit of dutifulness and obedience to authority that they are undertaken?

We must crave the indulgence of our readers in explaining how our attention was first directed to the house of Loretto; as at first sight it might appear that we were enlisting their sympathies in a mere personal matter. The work of the Abbé Caillau professes to be a critical as well as devotional history of the Santa Casa. It professes to have disposed of every species of objection that had been urged against the legend connected with it, in the most satisfactory way, and thereby vindicated the devotional aspect in which it has been so long regarded by the faithful of his communion. This book was placed in our hands by a perfect saint—a man whom it was impossible to know without loving, and to be upon intimate terms with, as we were, without feeling that his 'conversation' was 'in heaven.' He has since given the greatest proof of devotedness to the cause of his Lord and Saviour that a man could give. He has left friends and home, to go out as a missionary, and that to Cochin China!—a country where persecutions, equal in horror and atrocity to any that are to be found in the annals of primitive Christendom, are still rife, and hardly a year passes in which the sufferings of some new martyr do not approve themselves to be still the most efficacious means of propagating the faith. But, as regards the book in question, his words were, 'Read it, and you will be 'convinced of the truth of the story: convinced of the truth of 'the story, you will become a Catholic.' He little knew the real grounds on which he believed it when he said this, or how little his own piety depended upon the truth or falsehood of the

legend of the Santa Casa. It was, however, his parting request, and we consequently looked upon the study of M. Caillau as a sacred duty. But never should we have considered ourselves bound to make our results public, had it not soon ceased to be a mere question between two friends. M. Caillau turns out to have been accepted in France as the standard authority for all that is trustworthy respecting the Santa Casa. M. Rohrbacher accepts his statements without criticism, and has given them a conspicuous place in his Ecclesiastical History. The excellent Abbé Gosselin has condensed them in a work intended for the use of students in the Seminary of S. Sulpice. Whether the 'Univers' has accepted them with the same implicit confidence or not, it has lately published, among other anecdotes of a distinguished individual, the following, as not the least interesting:—

'En quittant Rome, le Père Newman et le Père Saint-John se rendirent au sanctuaire de Notre-Dame de Lorette, et ils eurent le bonheur de dire la messe dans la Sainte Maison, le 12 Décembre, jour même de la translation.'[1]

Now, the ecclesiastical history of M. Rohrbacher has become the text-book of the French clergy, long since too ultramontane for Fleury; the Seminary of S. Sulpice is their great theological training college, the 'Univers' their leading religious journal; finally, the French clergy themselves are, as a body, perhaps, the most enlightened of the vast Roman hierarchy. It is plain that the book of M. Caillau has been endorsed by them; and we see that in the object for which it was written they would seem to have the cordial sympathies of one of the most extraordinary individuals that England ever has given to the Church of Rome. Contrariwise, who are they by whom a vindication of truth has been attempted? We cannot congratulate ourselves upon their relative merits. The fame of the Abbé Michon in his own country does not stand high; and certainly nobody would dream of putting either his intellect or his literary or theological acquirements into competition with those of the late Vicar of S. Mary the Virgin, Oxford; or his sanctity with that of the eminently pious M. Gosselin. Besides, though he rejects the legend, it does not appear that he has ever read the work of M. Caillau in vindication of it, nor, indeed, should we say that he had done more than use his own eyes on the subject, and that in some respects unsatisfactorily.[2] What we have done, therefore, is to put our readers in possession of the historical

[1] Le T. R. Père Newman. Notice Biographique par Jules Gondon. Samedi, 12 Nov. 1853.

[2] That is, in asserting still that the house is of brick.

details of our inquiry, nakedly stated; which, it will be seen, is based upon a criticism of the work of M. Caillau. Good man as he may be, and, from the religious tone of his book, probably is, we regret to say that we never, in the whole course of our ecclesiastical researches, met with a story so false, or the truthfulness of history so violated in support of it. One can understand a person accepting reputed facts upon authority, without further investigation; but with what conscience—unless there be such a thing as a religiously blind one—M. Caillau could have alleged the following writers in support of the legend, it is wholly beyond Anglican casuistry to explain. It is a bare act of justice to them that they should be disabused *seriatim;* and for what they are thus recklessly pleaded in attestation of, let M. Caillau be heard in his own untranslated words:—

'Auteurs qui ont écrit sur la Maison de la très-sainte Vierge, *tant qu'elle fut à Nazareth.*'

This is the heading of the chapter.

'Sans parler des saints Evangiles . . . . nous trouvons plusieurs témoignages sur la maison de la sainte Vierge en cette ville dans les écrivains suivants . . .'[1]

is the introduction to the following list of authors. We have gone through them to the best of our ability, so that the difference between our discoveries and his can arise from no mere difference of editions. Will our readers indeed have patience to wade through the extracts which follow, on the score that the moral which is deducible from them may be found not a little instructive?

Eusebius (4th century), Vit. Constant. iii. 42, and 43 (not 45), speaks of the journey of Helen, mother of Constantine, to the East: and of her adoration (agreeably with the words of the prophet) before the place where His feet stood . . . subsequently of her dedication of two churches in His honour; one at the cave of His Nativity; and the other on the mount from which He ascended into heaven. The place of His Nativity is immediately afterwards said to be called Bethlehem by the Hebrews. Both spots and both churches that were built upon them, are sufficiently dwelt upon; but nothing is said about Nazareth, or indeed any points connected with it. So much, therefore, for the first and earliest authority for the existence of a house there.

S. Epiphanius is the testimony which is next adduced. Hæres. xxx. 11. On the preceding heresy (xxix. 6, Ed. Petav.) he had already said without doubt that our Lord was called a Nazarene because he had been educated at the town of Nazareth,

[1] Introd. pp. vii. viii.

then a village, in the house of Joseph (ἐν οἴκῳ Ἰωσήφ), while He had been born at Bethlehem according to the flesh, of the Virgin Mary, who had been betrothed to Joseph then living at Nazareth, subsequently to his removal from Bethlehem to settle in Galilee . . . . He had said all this doubtless in a cursory manner, with a view to account for the application of the term Nazarene to our Lord; but what does he say in the passage to which our attention has been especially directed? Why, simply, that before the time of the Count Joseph, Nazareth was one of the places where it had hitherto been found impracticable to have churches built, owing to its exclusive occupation by the Jews.

The next reference is no less unfortunate than it is inaccurate. It is as follows:—'S. Jerome Lettres à Eustochium et a Eusèbe, et Lieux Sacrés de la Palestine.'

S. Jerome was doubtless the father of all others whose testimony might have been supposed to have been most explicit. Upwards of thirty years of the latter part of his life were spent in the Holy Land; he had made a complete tour of it in company with Paula, mother of Eustochium, whose enthusiasm, to say the least, kept pace with his own: for the benefit of the daughter he composed a most graphic account of all the places visited by them, and the interest which attached to each respectively; and it can scarce be thought that so fervid a writer as S. Jerome would have passed over a single incident that the traditions of his day recorded, which might have awakened feelings of awe and rapture in the mind of his favourite devotee. But we have still more than this even extant among his writings. We have preserved amongst his Epistles a letter, the joint composition of Paula and Eustochium themselves, and its principal object is to induce Marcella to come and join them in the Holy Land, that she might with them enjoy the exquisite pleasure of beholding those hallowed spots in which 'the mysteries of our redemption' had been accomplished. And the letter winds up by anticipation with a glowing picture of the most remarkable sights that were in store for her on her arrival. Well, what are the allusions made to Nazareth by the eloquent Presbyter and Doctor, and his female companions: in what choice terms do they designate that heavenly habitation which was destined to become the theme of so much medieval enthusiasm? While Bethlehem is described with all the minuteness of one whose gaze has been riveted to a spot in silent ecstasy, where much remained to fill the mind even to overflowing with associations of the past; while the grotto of the Nativity is saluted with the endearing names of the villa of Christ, hospice of Mary, cave of the Saviour—all that survived in Nazareth was to be found in its name—that,

etymologically, the word signified the flower of Galilee;[1] or else in the bare fact supplied by the Evangelists, that it was the place where Christ was brought up.[2] Is it likely, we ask, that had those fond objects of interest since attributed to the locality been in existence then, they would have been so completely ignored? The very multitude of pilgrims who we are told had flocked thither from all quarters of the world, when S. Jerome wrote, would make such a supposition still more improbable; as they would have been sufficiently talked about beyond all doubt had they existed.[3] The two next authorities we have done our best to verify, but without success. The former stands thus: 'S. Paulin. Epitre a Sévère' (431.) That S. Paulinus, bishop of Nola, did correspond with Sulpitius Severus is of course undeniable. Fourteen letters are preserved of the former to the latter; and one from the latter to the former; but in none of them that we have ever seen is there the slightest allusion to the case in point: one, as is well known, details at length the discovery of the Cross by the mother of Constantine; and this it is probably to which the reference is made with the same truthfulness that the Life of Constantine by Eusebius was adduced in the first place.[4]

We say that we have been unable to verify these passages, as we would almost prefer that our ignorance or stupidity should be taxed to any extent than that statements should be so monstrously abused as there seems a strong probability for sup-

[1] Paul. and Eustoch. ad Marcell. Ep. xlvi. Inter. Ep. S. Hieron. vol. i. p. 207. Ed. Vallars.

[2] Nutriculam Domini. Ep. cviii. Ibid. p. 697.

[3] We have since made a discovery which completes the climax of disingenuous citation, as it occurs in one that we had hitherto believed to have been above suspicion. But there seems a fatality about these subjects, from which even the strongest minds cannot escape. *Benedict XIV.* quotes S. Jerome (*Ep. ad Eustoch.*) as saying, 'Est Nazareth ubi Christus egit, viculus in Galilæâ juxta montem Thabar, unde et Dominus noster Jesus Christus Nazarenus vocatus est; habet Ecclesiam in loco quo Angelus ad B. Virginem Evangelizaturus intravit, sed et aliam ubi Dominus est Nutritus" . . . Whence do these words come? They *are a gloss on the word 'Nazareth'* in a spurious work called 'De Actis Apostolorum,' in which S. Jerome himself is cited. V. Marian. Victor. ad. l. Op. S. Hieron. Tom. iii. p. 512. Vallars thinks it bears marks of the Venerable Bede.

[4] Ep. xxxi. Ed. Murat.

We have since found out that such is literally the case, and M. Gosselin defends the citation by the occurrence of the word 'Incarnationis,' § 4, though nothing is said before or afterwards of Nazareth. It is quite clear that it refers to what had been said of Bethlehem in the preceding §, and therefore = 'Nativitatis' in the present instance. With equal inaccuracy M. Gosselin makes James of Vitry say, 'Ac sæpè in ædc, ubi ab Angelo salutata est Maria, rem divinam fecisse?' No such passage occurs in his work. Even had it been his, '*ædc*' would not be rightly translated 'maison.' (Vol. iii. p. 393.) Still more unpardonably he makes Godfrey de Beaulieu (Ibid. p. 394), his own countryman, say, 'Dans la chambre sacrée de la Mère de Dieu' . . . S. Louis communicated, The words are, 'in altari Annuntiationis,' as we have translated them below. What is one to infer from such perverse quoting?

posing that these have been, with a view to impose upon simple minds.

The next citation is made thus:—'Saint Grégoire de Tours, Histoire de France.' Liv. iii. chap. 39; Et Liv. v. chap. 3 (553.)

Either there is a mistake in the numbers of the books or the chapters, as there is nothing approaching to the subject in those which are cited. But in B. II. c. 39, the place to which probably the first reference was intended to point, we read,—

'This person is said to have been in the East, and to have visited the places of the Saints; and to have even gone to Jerusalem, and often seen the places of the Passion and Resurrection of our Lord mentioned in the Gospels . .'[1]

To be sure the Bishop of Tours, in another work,[2] asserts that the apostles met at the house of the blessed Virgin to witness her death, but without saying where her house was. Now, it is a very general tradition, that she breathed her last at Ephesus, in the house of S. John: consequently Nazareth could not have been their rendezvous.

We now come to a much more circumstantial though comparatively late authority; one who had his account of Nazareth itself from a devout pilgrim and French prelate,—

'Nazareth,' says Adamnan,[3] 'as Arculfus, who stopped there, records, is not, like Capharnaim, surrounded by walls, standing as it does upon a mountain; yet for all that, it has vast *stone* edifices (the word "stone" should be remembered well), and likewise two very large churches built there. One is in the midst of the city, constructed upon two (caucros) vaults, where *formerly had been built* the house in which our Saviour was brought up. This same church then, as I said before, stands upon two mounds, and is supported by two arches placed under it; while below, between the two mounds, is a very clear fountain, which is the constant resort of the inhabitants coming from all parts to draw water there; more than this, water is hoisted up from thence by means of windlasses into the church that is built over it. The other church is erected over the spot where the house *had been built* in which the angel Gabriel visited the blessed Mary, and spoke to her when he had found her alone, the same hour. This information respecting Nazareth I had from the holy Arculfus, who remained there two nights and as many days . . .'

Adamnan, therefore, may be considered the first authority who has left any specific mention of the edifices which Nazareth contained in his day;[4] and these he records to have been built

---

[1] Hist. Franc. ii. 39.

[2] De Glor. Mart. i. 4, and Ruinant ad l.

[3] Adam. de Locis Sanctis, ii. 26.

[4] That is of the alleged authorities. There is a curious Itinerary (Hodœporicon) of S. Willibald, written it is said by his sister about A.D. 765, which contains the following simple tale:—'Their devotions performed, they went on to Galilee, to that place where Gabriel first came to the Holy Mary—"Hail full of grace," d so forth. Here there is now a church, and the village in which the church is, Nazareth. This church Christian men have been often in the habit of redeeming n the heathen, when the latter have been meditating its destruction.' Ap. iisii Thesaur. Vol. ii. p. 110. Ed. Basnage.

of stone; and the most worth mentioning were two churches that had been built over spots *occupied formerly* by two houses; one in which our Lord had been brought up; and the other in which the Visitation of the blessed Virgin Mary took place. In these days, therefore, there were supposed to *have been two* houses of interest there, *not one;* and that, in which our Lord had been brought up, was not the same with that in which the angel Gabriel visited S. Mary. We repeat, there *had been* two houses where these churches were standing in the days of Arculphus; not that they then existed. Is it credible that he would have passed them over without a word, when he did not hesitate to dilate upon the churches that stood over the spots once occupied by them? It is true that the expressions, 'ubi quondam illa fuerat ædificata domus;' and again, 'ubi illa fuerat domus constructa' do not actually preclude the possibility that they might have been even then in existence with the two churches built over them; but what if these two words 'ædificata' and 'constructa' are interpolations, or at all events were not intended to convey more or less than the simple 'fuerat' in either case? It is seldom that we have so complete a clue to the meaning of a writer as we have in the present instance; and the authority is not one that can be lightly set aside. Venerable Bede was a contemporary of Adamnan, and possibly may have seen him during his sojourn with Aldfrid, king of Northumberland. At all events he was so charmed with the treatise upon the Holy Places, that he has inserted a long extract from it in the fifth book of his History; and analysed it in his smaller treatise that goes by the same name. Here, therefore, we see unquestionably how Venerable Bede understood these expressions, if he did not transcribe them literally as they then stood; for, according to him, the account says respecting the two churches,—

'One is in the midst of the city, standing upon two arches, *where had formerly been* the house (ubi quondam fuerat domus) in which our Lord was brought up when a child. . . . . The other church *is* where the house *was,* (ubi domus erat) in which the angel came to the blessed Mary. . . .'[1]

Nay, so completely was he of opinion that all traces of the houses had disappeared, that in his 'Explication of the names of places occurring in the Acts of the Apostles,' he only speaks of the two churches as standing on the spots (in the one case 'in loco, quo;' in the other merely 'ubi') where the events had taken place.

It is therefore with singular truthfulness, for once in the way, that Bede is set down in the list of authorities as saying the same with the one immediately preceding him, *i. e.* with

[1] De Locis S. Libell. c. 15.

Adamnan. Not so with the one which follows next in order after him. Quite the reverse. Not a word occurs in the life of S. John Damascene, by John, patriarch of Jerusalem, that can possibly be tortured into connexion with the point to be proved. Can it have been that it was thought *apropos* to the legend that S. John is there said to have had his right arm, which had been cut off by order of Leo the Isaurian, restored whole to him after prayer to the Blessed Virgin Mary before her image?[1] It is surely less relevant to the point that he is afterwards[2] said to have gone to *Jerusalem* and performed suitable acts of devotion in those hallowed localities. What too, by the way, has been said connected with the subject by S. John himself? According to him S. Mary was born not in the house of S. Anne, but, as indeed would appear most probable, in the house of Joachim, her father, wherever that was—for here opinions vary—ἐν τῷ τῆς Προβατικῆς τοῦ Ἰωακεὶμ οἴκῳ.[3] Certain it is, however, that if it existed in Jerusalem, as the general account is, and on the spot where the church afterwards so called stood,[4] it did not survive the destruction of that city by the Romans.[5] Moreover S. John asserts of the Blessed Virgin Mary that she breathed her last in Jerusalem, which, he adds, had been her abode ever since the Ascension of her Son.[6]

Metaphrastes is the next author, and his lives of the Saints generally the next reference. We cannot say that we have gone through them very carefully; nor do we think that the vagueness of the citation and our own experience of the inaccurate manner in which former citations have been made, would require that we should do so. Besides, Simeon Metaphrastes is a writer of doubtful age, fluctuating according to the opinion of critics between the 9th and the 14th century,[7] and still more doubtful authority. Few would admit him to be anything like a decisive witness. Then again most of his lives are embodied in the larger work of Surius; and in looking through the latter with some care we could discover not a single passage that bore upon the legend in question, but only some general testimonies in favour of pilgrimages, and of the reverence in which the Holy Land had been held in all ages by Saints and Doctors of the Church.

How Nicephorus Callistus comes to be cited as a writer of the 12th century we know not: his age, never as far as we can discover, having been disputed. 'He flourished under the Palæologi,' says the Biographie Universelle, and is said 'to have

[1] c. 18. [2] c. 22. [3] De Orthod. Fid. iv. 14.
[4] Homil. in Dormit. B. V. M. I., 6.
[5] Le Quien ad. iv. 14. De Orthod. Fid. sup. cit.
[6] Homil. II. in Dormit, B. V. M. c. 4.
[7] Cave, Hist. Lit. sub. v. A.D. 901.

survived to the year A.D. 1350.'[1] Still we will take him in order as we find him, especially as he is detailing what took place in a much earlier age. And here we will not congratulate the believers in the Holy House on the general character of the first historian thus adduced who mentions in explicit terms the existence of the fond object of their devotion: we would rather condole with them on the monstrous error in the context, which is more than sufficient to discredit the veracity of the writer in the rest of his statement. Nicephorus says that S. Helen

'Having come down eastwards from thence, *i. e.* from Mount Tabor, arrived at Nazareth: and when she had found the house where the angelic salutation took place, built a beautiful church in honour of the Mother of God.'[2]

Had the monk of S. Sophia ever visited the Holy Land, he would have known that Nazareth lies to the *north-west* and not the *south-east* of Mount Tabor. By his egregious ignorance of topography therefore, he has undermined his own credibility for his next assertion, and saved us the trouble of inquiring how many centuries he lived after S. Helene, where he got his authority for a fact unrecorded by Eusebius and the earlier ecclesiastical historians from whom he draws; or how far he is to be accepted as a witness to the *prior* existence of the house in Nazareth, when he does not make the slightest allusion to its removal, which, if the legend be true, must have occurred in the age preceding his own, *i. e.* A.D. 1291.

William of Tyre (liv. ix. etc.) would have been trustworthy evidence, though of course comparatively late evidence, for a fact of this nature hitherto unnoticed by earlier writers. Yet we have searched his history of the Holy War without success for any explicit statement respecting the Holy House, and more particularly the ninth book to which we are referred. Here, indeed, (c. 13 Edit. Herold) we meet with the remarkable facts, that Tancred was invested with the sovereignty of Galilee and the adjacent maritime parts, and that he

'Founded (*i. e.* rebuilt) two churches of the same diocese with exceeding great care, enriching them with ample patrimonies: to wit, that of Nazareth and that of Tiberias—of Seir, of Mount Tabor—besides contributing to their ecclesiastical decorations. . . .'

And then he adds most significantly,—

'Not a small portion of these has been lost to these venerable spots, through the fraud and calumnies of subsequent princes.'

Again, in the fourteenth chapter we meet with a glowing mention of the cave of Bethlehem, and of the devotion with which the holy places about Jerusalem were visited, but nothing more about Nazareth. So that we could not have supposed that these could have been the passages intended, had not the pre-

[1] Sub v. [2] E. H. viii. 30.

vious quotations been even still more incompatible with good faith.

Now, however, we are coming to writers far more definite and explicit, if they do not prove too much; and of these John Phocas, a contemporary of William of Tyre, and whose journey to the Holy Land can be fixed with accuracy to the year A.D. 1185, is rightly placed first. His description of Nazareth, besides being that of a positive eye-witness, is so minute and circumstantial that it shall be transcribed at length; and our readers will be pleased to compare it with the description of the Holy House which will be given *apropos* to its first translation.

'In the midst of the various hills and at the bottom of a valley formed by them, stands the town of Nazareth, in which the great mystery of glad tidings was made known to the Virgin Mother of God by the archangel Gabriel. . . . Immediately on entering the first gate of this village-town there is the church of the archangel Gabriel, and on the left side of the altar in it is seen a small cave in which there is a bubbling fountain that sends up pure streams. Here the most immaculate Mother of God, after she had been entrusted by the priests to holy Joseph and placed under his protection, used to come to draw water daily; and here it was that, six months after the conception of the messenger, coming as usual for that purpose, she was first saluted by Gabriel; and when in her consternation she had gone off trembling to the house of Joseph, she heard there from the angel those words, "Hail, thou art highly favoured;" and immediately upon her answering, "Behold the handmaid of the Lord, be it unto me according to thy word:" she received the Word of God in her spotless womb. This said house of Joseph was afterwards transformed into a most beautiful church; on whose left side near about the altar there is a cave, not patent to any great depth, but only visible as far as the surface. Its mouth is adorned with white marble slabs, and upon it the skill of the artist has depicted a winged angel in the act of descending to her that had never known man, but was about to become a mother; and finding her engaged in spinning he salutes her with the glad tidings and with becoming reverence. And he is represented as in the act of speaking to her. But she, alarmed at the unexpected sight, turns away in confusion and amaze, so that her work is on the point of falling from her hands. And quitting the chamber in her terror she meets her beloved kinswoman, whom she salutes with many embraces.

'Proceeding from the mouth within the cave you come down a few steps, and thus gain a view of that which was anciently the house of Joseph, in which after her return home from the fountain, as I said before, the Archangel thus saluted the Virgin. Now on the spot where the salutation took place there is a cross of black stone graven in relief upon white marble, and above it an altar, and on the right side of the said altar a small cot[1] in which the ever-Virgin Mother of God had her chamber. But on the left side of (the place of) the salutation is seen another small cot without inlet for the light,[2] in which our Lord Christ is said to have dwelt after his return from Egypt till the beheading of the Baptist. . . .'[3]

And so Phocas ends his very interesting description, on which we shall take occasion to comment more largely hereafter.

[1] Μικρὸς οἰκίσκος. [2] Οἰκίσκος ἀφώτιστος.

[3] Compend. Descript. c. 10, ap. Leon. Allat. Συμμικτά, v. Corp. Byzant. Hist. vol. xxv., ad fin.

James of Vitry flourished about A.D. 1220. He was born near Paris, and died cardinal bishop of Frascati. But he had once been bishop of Ptolemais, and seems to have spent some time there. He has left moreover a somewhat minute description of the Holy Places in a work of his called Historia Hierosolimitana, so that it will be as well perhaps to hear all that he says of Nazareth. These are his words:—

'Nazareth is a small town in the entrance of Galilee to the west, situated amongst the mountains. It is here that according to some the Blessed Virgin was born. It is beyond doubt at all events that she dwelt here subsequently to her betrothal to Joseph—that holy maid, I say, to whom the Angel was sent to tell the first tidings of our salvation. This holy town, so acceptable to God (in which the Word was made Flesh, and was conceived in the womb of the Virgin a flower odorous above all scents; whence it is with good reason interpreted to mean a flower) rejoices above all other towns in this special privilege, namely, that in it our Lord laid the foundations of our salvation; and likewise condescended to be brought up there, and submit Himself (Whom all things in heaven and earth obey) to His parents. . . .'[1]

Curious indeed that a cardinal-bishop, a companion of the Crusaders, and of that date, should know so little, or at least say so little, of the actual remains of that favoured locality. But how much more ominous than even this is the absence of any specific mention of the charmed-house in the visit of that pilgrim of pilgrims to Nazareth, S. Louis—so faithfully recorded notwithstanding, as it is by his companion and Confessor Godfrey de Beaulieu.

'I cannot,' he says, 'pass over in silence the humility and truly Catholic spirit with which the devoted king demeaned himself in the pilgrimage which he made from Acre to that holy and devoted Nazareth. On the eve of the Annunciation he proceeded clothed in sack-cloth next his skin from Sepphoris, where he had lain all that night, to Cana of Galilee. Thence he passed on to Mount Tabor, and thence, the same eve, to Nazareth. But no sooner had he come within sight of that sacred place afar off than he dismounted from his horse, and on his knees made a most profound reverence, and so he proceeded on foot till he humbly entered the holy town and pious spot of the Annunciation. That day he fasted devoutly on bread and water, notwithstanding his previous great fatigue. And how devoutly he conducted himself there, and how solemnly and worthily he caused to be celebrated both vespers, matins, and mass, and all other offices appropriate to so high a feast: those persons who were present can well attest; of whom some can testify, or rather assert, with truth, that since the Son of God assumed flesh of the glorious Virgin in the same spot, there never was any solemnity so holily and devoutly celebrated there.

'Moreover, mass being performed on the altar of Annunciation, the pious monarch received the holy Communion. Further my Lord Odo, of Frascati, legate of the Apostolic See, celebrated a solemn mass at the larger altar of the church, and preached a touching discourse. Such was the Catholic disposition of the king, that he would have the ornaments of the church of the most costly and hallowed kind—and according to the

[1] Ap. Gesta Dei per Francos, p. 1078.

various solemnities, so he had the ornaments or furniture of divers colours; and to this he himself paid special regard. Besides which, he was zealous in procuring indulgences from the Pope, his Holiness, and from the other prelates; and when obtained he would frequent them with all devoutness and humility. . . .'[1]

This pilgrimage, be it observed, was made about A.D. 1253, and is probably the last upon record before the final expulsion of the Christians from Palestine. We now enter upon a perfectly new epoch.

Torsellus Sanutus, the next authority cited, could not possibly have attested the existence of the holy house *at* Nazareth, for according to the legend it was removed *from* Nazareth by angels, A.D. 1291, whereas he composed the account of the five tours which he had made into the Holy Land A.D. 1306. The question is, how comes he not to have a single word about its removal *from* Nazareth? *Five* different pilgrimages he had made into those hallowed regions: and he evidently intended to recount a good deal that travellers in general had not the means of getting access to and making public: for his work is entitled 'The Book of the secret things of the faithful servants of the Cross.'[2] Let us hear all the mystery connected with Nazareth that he is able to divulge:—

'At Nazareth is *shown the place* where the angel Gabriel, messenger of God, announced the approaching fulfilment of the ancient scheme for the redemption of the world; of which I have spoken before. Part vii. c. 2. (He there dwells on the fertility of the spot, and on the tradition which speaks of the child Jesus drawing water from the fountain of Sephoris: but nothing more relevant to the point in question). In the chapel there built were three altars: and the chapel was hewn in stone out of the rock, like to the spot of Nativity, and of the Resurrection; indeed, great part of the town was of old hewn out of the rock, as is still evident. . . . . .'

A little lower he speaks of Sephoris as the town from which S. Anne drew her origin as well as her husband Joachim. And still lower, speaking of the remains in Cana of Galilee, he has a remark which may not be out of place as a general observation:—

'These places, as indeed others in which Christ did (operatus est) anything, are *under ground:* and persons descend to them by many steps into a crypt: *as is the case with the spot both of the Annunciation and the Nativity* and many others: of which the reason seems to be that, in consequence of the frequent destructions of churches, their ruins have stood out above the surface of the ground; and so when these have been levelled for the purpose of erecting other buildings, the faithful, in order to be able to build over the former spots, have made steps by which they go down to them, as so many crypts. . . . . .'[3]

---

[1] C. 22, p. 41., Vit. S. Ludov., ed. Minerv.

[2] Liber secretorum fidelium Crucis. Lib. iii. p. 14, c. 7, ap. Gesta Dei per Francos, p. 253.

[3] Comp. too Brocardi Descript. Terræ S. ap. Canisii Thesaur. vol. iv. 'De Cana Galileæ,' p. 13. Ed. Basnage, where almost the same words occur—he by the

And then he proceeds to speak of a great many more ruined edifices, tenanted by wild beasts and the like.

This work, we remark, it is upon record,[1] was presented to John XXII. one of the Popes of Avignon, in the year A.D. 1321: nor do we hear that the author was reproached for his want of accuracy, or for his silence upon a point of so much local interest and increasing celebrity. To be sure John XXII. was not upon the best of terms with the inhabitants of Recanati: their chiefs had espoused the cause of his enemies; and themselves had lent too much countenance to the errors of the Fratricelli to be favourably regarded by him.[2] He is not therefore enumerated among the Popes who added to the privileges of the Holy House: and if, indeed, as has been said, he was of a sceptical turn of mind, what wonder should it appear that he was not even acquainted with its history? The silence of other contemporary Popes is infinitely more perplexing, as we shall observe presently: meanwhile, we take the liberty of obtruding the evidence of some four or five pilgrims of our own finding, who followed Sanutus to the Holy Land successively for two centuries and upwards, and strikingly confirm his positive statements as to what was then standing in the said locality: while they are no less ominously silent as to what is asserted to have been so mysteriously removed and verified.

William de Baldensel—his proper name was Otto de Rienhuzz—returned from his pilgrimage to the Holy Land about the end of the year A.D. 1235, and in compliance with the request of Cardinal Taleyrand, published a full account of his travels, from which it appears that Nazareth was regarded by him with no small interest. His description of it is as follows:[3]—

'Turning from the plain country of Galilee, I came to the most holy town of Nazareth, now a rustic village, without fortifications, the houses and dwellings not being collected, but dispersed and distant one from the other. . . . To be brief, in this place is celebrated the Conception of Christ, more wonderful than all the works of God, in the virginal womb made fruitful by the overshadowing of the Holy Spirit, a most noble production, exceeding the order and bounds of nature. In this spot there *was* a beautiful church—and large withal—but alas! it has been, as it were, destroyed! A small place, however, in it has been covered over, and is very diligently guarded by the Saracens, where, *near a certain marble column*, they assert that the venerable mysteries of the Conception were consummated.

way (v. Basnage) travelled about the same time that Jacob of Vitry wrote—with this interesting variation: 'Owing to frequent destructions the ruins above the surface have been levelled, and still *Christians are ever endeavouring, as far as lies in their power, to discover the true spots in which this or that happened.* . . . .'

[1] And it was the interest which John took in the Holy Land that occasioned its presentation. See Rohrbacker E. H. vol. xx. pp. 85—88.

[2] Caillau, p. 52.

[3] Ap. Canis. Thesaur. Eccl. Mon. Ed. Basnage, tom. iv. p. 354.

'Nowhere are the Saracens so bad as they are at Nazareth, and it appears that they were so from olden times; so that it is said with reason in the Gospel, "Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?" inasmuch as it appertains to the infinite goodness of God to bring good out of evil: and effect the production of the best things out of the worst, by a most sweet arrangement. In the foresaid place the infancy of Christ is passed; He is educated by His parents, increases in age and favour, and for us is made subject to His parents, while at the same time the universe obeys His nod. A fountain is likewise shown there where the child Jesus used to bathe: and where clothes used to be washed by the Virgin His mother: and from it both Mother and Son were wont to carry water home for their human needs. *In the place of the Conception I caused to be celebrated a beautiful mass of the Annunciation of the glorious Virgin. . . . .*'

William was a knight of high degree; and travelled with a numerous retinue; and it was to do penance for his former adhesion to Lewis of Bavaria against the Pope that he had undertaken the pilgrimage; so that he probably examined every spot with unusually great advantage, besides extraordinary reverence —nothing would be likely to escape him or his followers. Whether or not his zeal offended the Saracens does not appear; but immediately on his return they grew so severe and rude that Benedict XII. preached a crusade against them, to which Philip VI. of France promised assistance.

All this is in entire harmony with the words of our own Sir John Maunderville; whose travels commenced A.D. 1327, and occupied him, it is said, thirty-three years.[1] Speaking of Nazareth and the events which occurred there, he proceeds:—

'This salutacioun was don in a place of gret awteer of a faire Chirche, that was wont to be somtyme; but *it is now alle downe:* and men hau made a litylle resceyt, besyde a pylere of that chirche, for to resceyve the offrynges of pilgrymes. And the Sarrayines keepen that place fulle derely, for the profyte that thei hau there offe: and thei bee fulle wykked Sarrayines and cruelle, and more dispytous than in ony other place, and hau destroyed alle the chirches. . . . .'[2]

A hundred years more, and upwards, and there was nothing but the same sad tale to tell by those who visited Nazareth— Bernard of Bredenberg, dean of Mentz, accompanied Count Solms and Philip de Bicker,[3] evidently found things in precisely the same state, though he seems to speak of the church as still existing—although dismantled—probably because Christian piety had already excavated what remained of the ruins. These are his words:—

'Nazareth, that blessed town of Galilee, in which the Virgin sprang from the root of Jesse, upon the Angel saluting her, conceived by the Holy Ghost the blessed fruit of her womb, Jesus Christ. It is distant from Acre seven

---

[1] Biograph. Universelle, J. V. [2] C. x. p. 112. ed. Halliwell, London, 1839. [3] See his Itinerary—said to be the first book of Travels ever printed—in the Bodleian Library, B. i. 16. Art. Seld. with the fly-leaf in MSS.

leagues. There is now-a-days in it an enduring spot, to wit, a church in honour of the blessed Virgin Mary, long since consecrated, and had in great reverence withal: but now-a-days it is very desolate (valdè desolata). In the same church is a *very small chapel—built on the spot of the Annunciation of our Lady*—where there is still a *marble column remaining*, against which the *Virgin herself leaned when* the angel Gabriel was sent to bring her the joyful message, contained in the words, "Hail, full of grace, the Lord is with thee: blessed art thou amongst women."

'There are three altars in the chapel; and it is *hewn in stone out of the rock:* as is the place of the Nativity, Passion, and Resurrection. A great part also of the town of Nazareth was anciently hewn out of the rock, which still appears.'[1]

One more extract and we have done. The celebrated French botanist and naturalist, Pierre Belon, travelled through Palestine towards the middle of the sixteenth century, or between A. D. 1540 and 1550,[2] and he has likewise left a brief but interesting account (being that of an eye-witness,) of Nazareth in the following words:

'What remained of the day, we spent in visiting Nazareth, and saw the place in which the Angel saluted the blessed Virgin; to wit, a small chapel built with vaulted roof, to which you must descend by steps, inasmuch as *it is subterraneous*. Also, in the same locality are seen the ruins of the church once built there by the Christians, whilst they were in possession of that region.

'Nazareth is inhabited by Arabs, men of short and slender stature, as are the rest of the Arabs.'[3]

Why we bring our citations to a close here will appear in due course. Here then let us pause, for the purpose of recapitulating briefly what is contained in these statements. It will be readily seen that they are for the most part neither indefinite nor inconsistent. We must begin by assuming that there was once a house at Nazareth inhabited by SS. Joseph and Mary, and our Lord. Thus much is clear from the words of the Evangelists SS. Matthew and Luke: nor has it ever been controverted as far as we know. Whether S. Mary had a house of her own there, and S. Joseph a house of his own there too, is not so clear from the Inspired Writers; meanwhile there cannot be so much as the shadow of a doubt that from the time that S. Joseph 'took unto him his wife,' as S. Matthew phrases it, they lived together in one house, and *that one* the house of S. Joseph, in which therefore the child Jesus was brought up;[4] as is moreover in exact harmony with the adduced authorities.

The next question is, was there any such house or houses standing at Nazareth subsequently to the bloody march of

[1] Part i. sect. 2.—the work is not paged. [2] Biograph. Univers. s. v.
[3] Observat. Lib. ii. 89. Ed. Antwerp. A. D. 1589.
[4] For Jewish customs, see Lewis Heb. Republ. b. vi. 36.

Vespasian through Galilee,[1] and the devastations committed by the Romans through Judæa under Hadrian, when we are told by Dio Cassius that no less than fifty of the principal strongholds, and 985 of the most celebrated *villages* there, were rased to the ground?[2] At all events nothing of the kind is so much as intimated by Eusebius, S. Epiphanius, S. Jerome, and S. Paulinus of Nola—the earliest authorities who might have been expected to have mentioned the circumstance, had it been so—S. Jerome especially and his companions—what intelligible account can be given of their silence? whereas the statement of S. Epiphanius may well be thought to supply positive evidence of a destructive character. Certainly Nicephorus, living in the fourteenth century, and speaking of events that happened about 1000 years before he lived, has asserted that S. Helene *did* 'find the house where the angelic salutation took place:' but what with the silence of the earlier writers from whom he draws, and his own ignorance of localities, so remarkably betrayed in the very next sentence, we might almost infer the very reverse of what he has thus vaguely asserted to be the actual truth.

At all events such house or houses had been obliterated when Arculfus visited these parts, and when Adamnan and Venerable Bede wrote. Two churches were then standing over the spots formerly occupied by two houses of the greatest interest to the Christian world: one, the house in which our Saviour had been brought up (according to the tradition of the day), and the other that in which the angelic salutation had taken place. Both these churches were spacious edifices, and of stone—evidently that of the country, for they are classed with the other stone buildings of the town—and below the first of them was a clear fountain. S. Willibald, in the 8th century, dwells upon the last, and says that it had often been redeemed by the Christians, when the heathen had been meditating its destruction. Possibly they had effected the destruction of the first; and there will be cause shown presently why the last may be supposed before long to have shared the same fate.

A wide jump—rendered necessary by a chasm in the authorities—and we are brought at once to the 12th century. And here we are informed expressly by William of Tyre, that Tancred rebuilt ('fundavit:'[3] it is certain from the context that he is here speaking of the material building, and not the diocese) the church of Nazareth—evidently the church of the Annunci-

[1] Joseph. De Bell. Jud. iii. 2 and seq. [2] Hist. Rom. lxix. 14.

[3] A similar use of the word, to all intents and purposes, occurs in lib. x. 26. Speaking of the town of Ptolemais, he says, 'Hanc frequens fama est geminos fratres *fundasse* Ptolomæum et Acconem, et muris vallasse solidioribus,' &c. Not but that Tancred did also much in the way of enlarging its ecclesiastical importance.

ation, and contributed largely to its endowments and ecclesiastical decorations; though some of the latter afterwards passed into other hands. This happened before Tancred was removed to Antioch, and therefore about A.D. 1100. From that time forward the Crusaders were more or less in undisturbed possession of the holy places, for the best part of a century. Godfrey, Baldwin I. and II., Fulk, Baldwin III., Amalric, Baldwin IV. and V., had successively occupied the throne of Jerusalem, and Phocas, our next definite authority, was fortunate enough to have made his tour of the Holy Land full three years before the terrible reverse came by which Jerusalem once more lapsed into the hands of the Saracens, A.D. 1188. What Phocas saw, therefore, was the church of Nazareth, as Tancred had rebuilt it, and much more beautified since his time. Could near 100 years have passed, and nothing have been done by those devoted enthusiasts, who had left house and home to shed their best blood in behalf of those hallowed spots, towards embellishing a place of so many thrilling emotions as the church of the Annunciation? Must we not imagine the successors of the saintly Godfrey and the romantic Tancred to have been at least as alive to the requirements of the ceremonial as we know S. Louis to have been there under unusually depressing circumstances? Phocas evidently saw many things there which S. Louis did not; it is therefore so much the more a matter of the most paramount importance to ascertain accurately what he did see.

And 1st. He is most explicit on the subject of the transformation of a house, and *that* the house of S. Joseph—in which also, according to him, the angelic salutation took place—into a magnificent church (*αὕτη ἡ τοῦ Ἰωσὴφ οἰκία μετὰ ταῦτα εἰς ναὸν μετεσκευάσθη περικαλλῆ*); a less sweeping change, indeed, than Arculfus had asserted so many centuries earlier. 2. Here, near the altar, was a *cave*, of which only the mouth was visible from without. 3. Marble slabs adorned the mouth, and a graphic picture of the Annunciation was hung over it. 4. Descending by *some few steps into the interior of the cave*, you get a view of the actual once house of Joseph[1] (*i.e.* at most, the remains of it, as he had before spoken of its transformation), 'in which the 'salutation took place. 5. The spot where the Annunciation 'took place was marked by a cross in black stone let into white 'marble, and above it an altar. 6. On the right of the said 'altar' (and therefore apart from the spot of the Annunciation) 'is seen a diminutive house, in which the Blessed Virgin Mary 'had her chamber; and 7, another diminutive house, without

[1] *τὴν πάλαι ταύτην ἐκείνην οἰκίαν τοῦ Ἰωσήφ.*

'ingress for the light, where our Lord is said to have lived till 'the beheading S. John.'

Thus, whereas there had been (as in the days of Arculfus) two separate churches built over spots *once occupied* by two distinct houses: now, one church had been rebuilt upon one of the sites, and a cave near the high altar contained what claimed to be those two very houses; and this description Phocas considered sufficiently minute to indicate all that was to be seen there then that deserved especial notice; and the greater part of this, it is evident, ought in fairness to be attributed to the piety of Tancred and those who succeeded him; else, how could Tancred be said to have founded the church? It is true that Tancred is nowhere said to have built those two diminutive houses, which Phocas observed within the cave; but it is also true that Phocas is the first, as well as the only, pilgrim who has mentioned the *existence* of any house or houses in connexion with the church; and that his statement can only be reconciled with that of Arculfus at the expense of their antiquity. With him, too, they are barely mentioned, and no hint whatever is thrown out that they contained anything—still less anything precious.

The pilgrimage of S. Louis indirectly confirms two particulars in the foregoing narrative. S. Louis communicated at the altar of the Annunciation: that one, doubtless, which Phocas represents as within the cave, immediately above the black cross that marked the spot of the salutation. Odo, the papal legate, celebrated mass at the larger altar of the church; evidently the altar of which Phocas speaks, in the church outside the cave. Had the two diminutive houses disappeared, or was it because there was nothing about them but the bare walls or rock, that the confessor of S. Louis has omitted to notice them?

We are now come to the end of our descriptions. In the days of Sanutus, William de Baldensel, Sir John Maunderville, Bernard, and Belon, all was in ruinous heaps.

'The place where the Annunciation took place is shown,' . . . .

says Sanutus. William proceeds:—

'In this spot *was* a beautiful church, and large withal; but now, alas! it has been, as it were, destroyed. A small place, however, has been covered over, and is very diligently guarded by the Saracens; where, near a certain marble column, they assert that the venerable mysteries of the Conception were consummated.'

Sir John explains the last sentence, while he adds force to the first:—

'*It is now all downe;* and men have made a litylle resceyt, beside a pylere of that chirche, for to resceyve the offrynges of pilgrymes. . . .

'It was a small subterraneous vaulted chapel, hewn in stone out of the rock, with steps down into it, and with three altars in it . .'

as Bernard and Belon add, besides confirming generally what had been said about it by their predecessors.

Thus, between the visit of S. Louis, A.D. 1253, and the commencement of the 14th century there had evidently been a complete destruction of the church of Nazareth, and, indeed, of all others thereabouts, as Sir John adds. The five travellers all with one voice assert that it was in ruins when they visited Nazareth; and all that had survived its destruction was the small 'rescet,' or 'place,' that had been covered over, and the 'marble' column or 'pylere of that chirche,' near which men said that the venerable mysteries of the Conception had been consummated; which finally we learn from Sanutus, in a general observation, and from Belon, in express terms, was underground, with steps leading down to it, as to a crypt. When and how, therefore, was the church destroyed? Is there any record extant that would consistently account for the utter desolation which is here so vividly and unequivocally depicted? There is, indeed, a witness, and a contemporary, and one of the highest order in every sense; and his testimony is the most explicit and consistent that could be desired, though it is too apt to be kept in the background by critics of a certain school. Urban IV. was patriarch of Jerusalem, when he was suddenly elevated to the pontificate, A.D. 1261; and his mind dwelt sensibly on those hallowed spots, as he says himself, which his eyes had seen, when it was his painful duty to announce the news of their entire subversion, from letters which he had received from persons on the spot, to his beloved son, S. Louis, A.D. 1263,[1] as follows:—

'Neither solicitations nor entreaties could induce the Babylonian Sultan to lay aside the settled hate, which he had inherited from his ancestors, against the Christian name and worship, by meditating plots and bringing forth iniquity. Thus it came to pass that he not only laid sacrilegious but destructive hands upon the venerable church of Nazareth, within whose compass the Virgin of virgins, saluted by the angel, conceived by the Holy Spirit, and was forewarned by angelic mouth of the birth itself; and *destroying it entirely* by means of the sacrilegious and nefarious ministers of his wickedness, he *levelled it to the ground by the demolition of its most august edifice*. .

'Yes indeed, if *we do not dissemble the events which have taken place*, we can see most clearly, that it was *with a view to the entire annihilation of the remains of Christianity* in the above-mentioned parts, that he invaded with so *much force and fiery zeal* the foregoing town, which was the strength of the said district in those parts; and that it was to *abolish*, by all the means in his power, the *name of the Lord entirely out of the land, that he destroyed the places of His Annunciation and Conversation*. And, as though the injuries done to

[1] The event really occurred A.D. 1262. See Abulfeda, Annal. A. F. 661, A.D. 1262.

so fond a Son would not affect so pious a Mother, or that His wrongs would cause her no offence, by destroying the church of Nazareth, in the way already recounted, *he manifested his special wrath against her. . . .*' [1]

We might well imagine from this glowing description that the tyrant had thus equalled the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, and not left 'one stone upon another.' Let us pass, therefore, fresh from this picture of annihilation, to the golden myth. Acre was now the only place remaining ('civitas ipsa sola'), as Urban himself attests, in the hands of the Christians; and we must beg our readers to transport themselves in thought, without more delay, to the very year in which its fall occurred. Pity that the scene of the legend should not have been laid exactly some twenty-nine years before; that is to say, some months anterior to the destruction of the church of Nazareth. There might have *then* been somewhat more colour for the following:—

'It was in the year A.D. 1291,[2] . . . . on the 10th of the month of May, about the second watch of the night, that the sanctuary of Nazareth had been deposited on the shores of the Adriatic, between Tersatz and Fiume, in a spot commonly called Rauniza by the natives of the country. . . .

'Towards daybreak some of the inhabitants were astonished on beholding the new edifice placed in a spot where nobody had ever up to that time seen either house or cabin. The report of the prodigy soon spread; people flock thither, examine, admire the mysterious building. It was constructed with small square red stones, held together by cement. All are astonished at its singular structure, its air of antiquity, its oriental shape; but the thing of all others that was most inexplicable was, how it maintained the erect position it did on the bare ground, without any foundations whatever to rest upon.

'Their surprise, however, was greatly enhanced on penetrating into the interior. The chamber formed an oblong square. The ceiling, surmounted by a small bell-turret, was of wood, painted azure, and divided into several compartments, bespangled here and there with stars of gold. Round the wall and beneath the cornice were remarked several half-circles, which ran round near one another, and were alternated with vases of divers shapes and varieties. The walls about the thickness of a cubit, were constructed without rule or regularity, and did not always correspond to the perpendicular. They were covered with a plaster, on which one saw painted the principal mysteries of this sacred place. A tolerably large door open on one of the sides, gave ingress into this mysterious abode. On the right opened a solitary narrow window; in front, somewhat elevated, stood the altar, made of square solid stones, on which was an ancient Greek cross, adorned with a crucifix painted upon linen, glued to wood, on which was inscribed the title of our salvation, "Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews." Near the altar one saw a small cupboard of singular simplicity, made to hold the necessary utensils for a poor establishment. It contained small vessels similar to those which mothers use for the purpose of feeding their

[1] Raynald. Contin. ad Baron. A.D. 1263, n. 7; or better, Du Chesne, Hist. Franc., vol. v. p. 868, where it is given *without gloss*.

[2] Translated from Rohrbacher, Hist. Univ. de l'Eglise C. vol. xix. p. 321 *et seq.* 2me Ed., who has analysed the Abbé Caillau.

infants. On the left was a species of chimney-piece or fire-place, surmounted by a precious nitch, sustained by columns, spiral and fluted, and terminated by a rounded vault formed by five crescents which joined each other, and were mutually interlaced. There was placed a statue of cedar representing the blessed Virgin, erect and bearing the child Jesus in her arms. Their countenances were painted with a species of colour like silver, but blackened by time and without doubt by the smoke likewise of the tapers that were burnt before these holy images. A crown of pearls placed on the head of Mary relieved the noble air of her forehead; her hair, parted after the manner of a Nazarene, floated on her neck and shoulders. Her person was clothed in a gilded robe, which, kept up by means of an ample girdle, descended in folds to her feet. A blue mantle covered her sacred back; both one and other were carved and formed out of the same wood as the statue itself. The child Jesus, exceeding in stature that of ordinary infants, with a countenance redolent of Divine Majesty, with a beautiful head of hair parted on His forehead like that of the Nazarenes, whose habit and girdle He wore, lifted the first fingers of His right hand, as it were to give the benediction; and in His left held a globe, to symbolise His sovereign power over the universe. The image of the holy Virgin on the moment of her arrival was covered with a red robe of wool, which is still preserved in the present day, and subsists without alteration. Such was the disposition of the holy chapel when it commenced its sojourn in Dalmatia. . . '

We break off here for the purpose of asking the question, Could this have been the actual house of either S. Joseph or S. Mary removed from Nazareth? And our reply is, that history—plain unvarnished history—has already most unequivocally returned answer in the negative. No *such* house could possibly have existed there without attracting the notice of such enthusiastic pilgrims as S. Jerome and his female friends. No remains of such a house could possibly have been standing at the time when Arculfus informed Adamnan, that, as Bede says, a church was standing on the spot where the house had once been. No such house or remains of such a house could have been standing at the time when Tancred rebuilt the church from the foundations, and not have been excepted from the expression which of course implies that even the previously existing church had been or was then taken down.

Benedict XIV. saw the utter hopelessness of attempting to meet the express statements of these earlier writers, and the plain inference drawn from them by Casaubon—although only about half of them are taken into account by the latter—and therefore he is constrained to take refuge in the comparatively modern account of Phocas, and to infer that it was the diminutive house—which was but a part, still a true part, of the original house—mentioned in the Itinerary that was afterwards said to have been removed.[1] But here, notwithstanding, there are absolute physical as well as his-

[1] De Serv. Dei Beatific. Lib. iv. part ii. c. 10, n. 10. Op. Tom. iv.; also De Festis B. V. M. Lib. ii. c. 16. Op. Tom. ix.

torical impossibilities involved, which not even that most ingenious of all popes could solve. For, first, the church which Phocas saw was the church of Tancred, and not the original edifice; still less, therefore, could the houses which he mentions have been earlier. Secondly, he saw two houses, not one; both of them within a cave, some way from the mouth, which was not wide, and subterraneous; both, too, were perfectly distinct from the actual spot of the Annunciation, which was external to them although near them. To have got one of them out entire and unbroken through the mouth of the cave, would have been at least as great a miracle as to have transported it afterwards by angelic agency to the shores of the Adriatic, and yet nothing of the kind has been recorded; besides, even so, we may still ask, would it have contained within it the scene of the Annunciation? Again, those houses which Phocas saw could have contained nothing of interest—had they not altogether disappeared—in the days of S. Louis, or they would have certainly been noticed by his confessor; and as for the supposition that one or both of them survived the entire demolition of the church mentioned by Urban—himself so well acquainted with and interested in those localities, and so unreserved in his account of the utter ruin that had taken place—and then, thirty years afterwards, was capable of being removed whole from its ancient site—when the whole country had been all that interval in the hands of Saracens exasperated to the last degree against the very name of Christianity, as we are told by Urban—in a state of far greater preservation and minute Christian embellishment than it had ever been in the palmiest days of Frank ascendancy—we say that to imagine this, is not less monstrous and incompatible with express contemporary testimony, than to consider either of the houses which Phocas saw identical with the one, or any part of the one, occupied by S. Mary full twelve hundred years before. But, on the other hand, were the account of the transportation itself to be examined, it would be found to involve not merely one, but both of these contradictions in their fullest force; for there it is assumed that the edifice which appeared near Fiume in A.D. 1291, was not merely the house which Phocas saw, but the actual house in which the blessed Virgin Mary had been born and lived—nay, though thirteen centuries of war and devastation had passed over it—apparently in the identical state in which she had left it!

We say it is *there assumed;* for we are now arrived at unquestionably the most offensive and deeply lamentable part of the story—a fell perversion of all that is pure and holy. Revelation is invoked to make known a lie; and she, the Virgin of

virgins, whose name claims to be associated for ever with all that is pure and of good report, that *she* should have been the one of all others selected to be surety for it! How truly does the devotion of her votaries resemble human love, when, for selfish ends, it is willing even to sacrifice the fair fame of the beloved one! But to proceed.

A bishop or presbyter, it is disputed which, of a church dedicated to S. George, it is not known where,[1] still a veritable ecclesiastic of some kind, Alexander by name, unexpectedly rushes among the crowd, and makes the prodigy complete by the account which he gives of his own miraculous cure, and of it,—

'In the night, on his bed of suffering, he had conceived the most ardent desire to go and contemplate with his own eyes the prodigy, of which he had just heard the news. The same moment he devotes himself to Mary, whose miraculous image had been described to him. All of a sudden heaven is opened to his view, and the Holy Virgin is seen in the midst of the angels who surround her, while with a voice whose sweetness ravished his inmost soul, "My son," said she, "you have called upon me, and lo! I am here to give you effectual assistance, besides revealing to you the secret which you so much desire to know. *Know, therefore, that the holy abode lately imported into these territories is the very house in which I was born and received almost my whole education. It is there that, at the tidings conveyed by the archangel Gabriel, I conceived, by operation of the Holy Ghost, the divine Child. It is there that the 'Word is made flesh.' Likewise, after my decease, did the Apostles consecrate this illustrious roof by the very divine mysteries, and dispute the honour of celebrating there the august sacrifice. The altar, transported to the same country, is the very one which was dressed by the apostle S. Peter. The crucifix, which people remark there, was placed there at another time by the Apostles. The statue of cedar is my likeness made by the hand of the evangelist S. Luke, who guided by the attachment which he had for me, has expressed by means of the resources of his art, the outline of my features as nearly as it was possible for mortal man.*" This house, dear to heaven, surrounded for so many ages by honour in Galilee, but now deprived of its homage in the midst of the decadence of the faith, has passed from Nazareth to these shores. Here there is no place for doubt. The author of this extraordinary event is God, with whom no word is impossible. For the rest, in order that you may yourself be the witness and publisher of these things, receive thy cure. Thy sudden return to health in the midst of so long a disease will confirm faith in the prodigy.'[2]

Alas! that 'the father of lies' should have been represented as speaking through a mouth so pure! We do not feel ourselves called upon to go through our extracts once more, for the

[1] Tersatz itself has never had a bishop, nor in those days had Fiume. V. Notit. Episcop. Orb. Christian. per Aubert. Miræum. Lib. iv. c. 8, 10. The only church of S. George that we can find noticed in those times and regions was that of Antibari, many hundred miles off. V. Presbyt. Dioclet. Reg. Dalm., and Croat. Gesta. s. v. Grubessa, R. 43. The town of S. Georgio, if it existed then, was more than one hundred miles to the south, and not a bit more episcopal. The catalogue of the bishops of Corbavo, in which diocese Tersatz was, does not supply such a name. V. Addit. ad Lucium, tom. iii. p. 469. Rer. Hung. Script. Ed. Schwandtner.

[2] Rohrbacher, Ibid. p. 323.

purpose of proving that this house could not by any manner of means have been the original house; no! not even by a new creation, nor by a preservation resembling that of the Seven Sleepers! Its description is self-destructive from first to last; and, being inseparable from the legend itself, it might almost appear that further confutation of the legend was rendered unnecessary. But, in fact, we have not come to anything like the most monstrous part of the case; only that here, to prevent confusion, it may be desirable to draw a broad line of demarcation between the historical results already arrived at and those which ensue. For, from our previous data, we conceive it follows, that by no manner of possibility that express historical testimony will admit of, can the house of Nazareth be strained into identity with that of Tersatz or Loretto; while, from the data which we are now about to supply, it will remain exceedingly doubtful whether Tersatz ever had a house at all, as also when that of Loretto first came into being.

For how is it that the story proceeds as regards Tersatz? Let M. Rohrbacher be heard once more:—

'Nicolas Frangipane, who then governed that country,[1] was absent: he had followed Rodolf of Hapsburg to the war. In the midst of this military expedition, he received the news of this miraculous event. The prince gave him permission to quit the camp, to go and assure himself of its truth: the length of the journey formed no obstacle. He proceeds in person to Tersatz, where, without allowing himself to be prejudiced by enthusiasm, he takes cognizance of the matter in the most minute way.'[2]

Slippery, indeed, are the foundations upon which the house of Tersatz is made to rest; far better, in the literal words of the legend, to have rested upon 'none whatever.' First, as regards Rodolph: he was engaged in no war at all. In the words of Coxe, 'he was now in his seventy-third year, and began to sink under the infirmities' of age. According to the same accurate writer, it was in the month of May, A.D. 1291, that he summoned the Diet of Frankfort, for the purpose of persuading the Electors to choose Albert as his successor.[3] This was the last act of his life; for, having attended the Diet, he breathed his last on the 15th of July following, in a small town on the Rhine called Germesheim. These facts are surely sufficient to prove, that Nicholas Frangipane could not have been attending Rodolph in the wars. Equally impossible is it that he could have been serving under Albert I. The Frangipanes, everybody knows, were a conspicuous Roman family. We hear of them

[1] All Dalmatia, Croatia, and Istria, that is, (see p. 321,) in the words of the legend. Raynaldus Contin. ad Baron. A.D. 1291, n. 71, would hide this incongruity by styling him 'Prætor' of those three countries.

[2] Ibid. p. 323.

[3] House of Austria, vol. i. c. iv. A.D. 1276—1291.

continually in and about Rome; though, in process of time, there was scarce a town of consequence throughout Italy into which they had not insinuated themselves.[1] When they first passed over into maritime Croatia is not so certain; but we are expressly told that it was by their help, and that of other equally distinguished Italian families in those parts, that Bela IV. effected his return into Hungary, subsequently to the Tartar invasion, and that upon all who had so assisted him the grateful monarch bestowed extensive lands and immunities.[2] This happened about A.D. 1274. Now, it was exactly A.D. 1291,[3] or seventeen years afterwards, that Andrew III., surnamed, in consequence of his pedigree, the Venetian, came to be king of Hungary; and, in the words of the annalist,[4] made it one of his first objects to conciliate the Venetians, who were the more ready to be won over by him, inasmuch as he was by family their compatriot. He, on the other hand, stood in the more need of their assistance, inasmuch as Albert, the son of Rodolph, had been nominated to the crown of Hungary by his illustrious father; and the Venetians, it is well known, occupied in those days the greater part of Dalmatia, maritime Croatia, and the adjacent islands, which they governed by means of podestas, prætors, or counts, sent out every third year, and nominated by the Doge.[5] Further, the Venetians, it is equally notorious, were never upon the best of terms with the emperors. It may be true, therefore, that between Christmas, A.D. 1290, and August 18th, A.D. 1291, some sharp fighting took place between the troops of Albert and Andrew; but it is no less expressly stated by the same local authorities, that all Dalmatia and Croatia had espoused the cause of the latter, and that, by August 18th of A.D. 1291, a lasting peace had been concluded between them. There are also those, like Belius, who place these events a year later, *i. e.* in A.D. 1292.[6] Accordingly, it follows upon all hands, either that there was no fighting at all, as early as the year A.D. 1291, between Albert and Andrew, or

---

[1] Muratori Rer. Ital. Script. tom. xxv. Index Famil. s. v., with the passages there referred to.

[2] Nicolai Isthuan. Hist. lib. ii. ad fin. (p. 18, ed. Vienna, 1758). Roger. de Destr. Hung. c. xl. ap. Script. Rer. Hung. vol. i. p. 321, ed. Schwandtner; and, for Bonfinius, see below (note).

[3] January 22d. See Lucius de Regn. Dalm. and Croat. iv. 10. Ladislaus, of course, died A.D. 1290.

[4] Annal Rer. Hungar. a Georgio Pray. lib. iv. ad A.D. 1291.

[5] Besides Moore's Italy, vol. i. Letter ix. ed. London, 1781, see Palladii Fusci Patav. de Situ Or. Illyric. lib. i. s. v., Albona and Flanona (ap. Lucii Dalmat. and Croat. p. 452, ed. Amsterdam, 1666); and Lucii de Regn. Dalm. and Croat. iv. 8 (ap. vol. iii. Rer. Hung. Script. ed. Schwandtner).

[6] Vide Katona, Hist. Rer. Hung. Andreas III. c. ix.—xix. A.D. 1291; Coxe's House of Austria, Albert I., A.D. 1291.

else that it was finished before August 18th of the same year; and that, *in any case*, Nicholas Frangipane, had he taken part in it, *must* have fought in the ranks of the Hungarians and of Andrew, and not those of Albert and the Imperialists.

But the far greater probability is, that he did not take part with either,—*i. e.* that he is a mythic personage. Contemporary history, as far as we can make out,—and we have searched it diligently,—does not even record his name. The legend, and all those who have enlarged upon it, of course say, that there was a Nicholas Frangipane in A.D. 1291, and add, likewise, that he then governed Dalmatia and Croatia. The *last part* of the sentence is *wholly false*, and, we doubt not, the first part too! for it is most certain from history, that for the whole of the 13th century, to go no further, nobody aspired to the title of governor of Dalmatia and Croatia collectively, but the Doge of Venice and the King of Hungary, and with neither of these has Nicholas ever even been supposed to have been identified.

Secondly, it is also most certain, that the greater part, especially the maritime part, of Dalmatia and Croatia, was divided under several Venetian counts, at the very time of which we speak, whose names are extant; but among these we do not find one called either Nicholas or Frangipane.[1] There was, indeed, a Nicholas Frangipane, count of Segna, a small town not far off Fiume, in the 15th century,[2] whose name likewise appears in Muratori connected with Venice; but, as for his apparently far more powerful namesake of the 13th century, we cannot discover a word about him, apart from the legend.

Thirdly, we have searched Hungarian annals and histories in vain for the slightest notice of the house of Tersatz,—its mysterious arrival and departure. All pass over the wonderful event in imperturbable silence. Even as late as the beginning of the 16th century, Tersatz is mentioned by a curious topographer,

[1] For the proofs of all this, we must be content to refer to the whole of the Fourth Book of Lucius de Regno Dalmat. and Croat. We find from the same source, c. xii., that Mladinus, count of Zara, taking advantage of the third revolt of that town, had actually *usurped* that style A.D. 1310. But his was the first usurpation on record: it was imitated by others afterwards.

[2] Nicolai Isthuan. Hist. lib. ii. ad f. ut sup. Murat. tom. xxii. p. 433. Comp. Ludov. Tuberon. Comment. de Suis Tempor. v. 8, ap Lucium, tom. ii. p. 200. That Bonfinius, the courtier of Mathias I. king of Hungary, and contemporary of the illustrious John, Martin, (see Decad. IV., lib. vi. p. 625,) Bernardus, or Beradinus, the said Nicholas (see Decad V., lib. iii. p. 727—8) and George (see Decad. V., lib. v. p. 752) Frangipanes, his faithful vassals, ('in cujus dictione ac tutelâ semper Frangipanes fuerant,') should have enlarged vaguely upon their ancient honours, is not surprising; but only so much the more unaccountable his utter silence about the legend, had it been known then in Hungary. According to him, the initials of those who assisted Bela IV. were M. and B. See his Rer. Hung. Decad. II. lib. viii. p. 308. Curiously enough, Jerome Angelita mentions him in his History of the Santa Casa: *so, perhaps, the honours of the Frangipane* —and why not the Frangipane too?—*were borrowed from him.*

and its shrine, dedicated to the blessed Virgin Mary, actually brought into close juxtaposition with the castle of the Frangipanes that stood not far from it; but not a hint is dropped that the shrine ever had any charm or celebrity attached to it except that of its miracles.[1] The way alone in which the legend has been so clumsily and so unworthily introduced among the events of A.D. 1294, by a recent Hungarian historian of voluminous fame, is all-sufficient to show when and where the story was coined. He is reduced to quote Italian authorities actually of the 16th century, as evidence of what happened in a profoundly obscure town of maritime Croatia towards the end of the 13th. . . .[2]

We may, therefore, conclude our inquiries into this part of the story with the unhesitating assertion,—and we challenge proof to the contrary,—that nothing had been heard about the house of Tersatz in Hungary, till the legend had been duly invented and carried thither across the Adriatic from the opposite coast. The shape of the shrine of Tersatz may doubtless have been copied, as the story says, from that of the house of Loretto, when the fame of the latter had acquired notoriety; and it is all of a piece that the first explicit mention of pilgrims coming from Tersatz to Loretto, on which even M. Rohrbacker can find it consistent with historical fidelity to dwell, is obliged to be assigned to the comparatively modern days of A.D. 1559.[3]

Finally, that we may not seem to leave any part of the legend of Tersatz untouched, if there are any who can believe it possible that a Christian bishop, (the above-mentioned Alexander, to wit,) attended by three faithful companions, could have quietly penetrated into the interior of Palestine, for the purpose of instituting archæological or ecclesiastical researches connected with Nazareth, in the very year that all Palestine lapsed back to the Saracens, and come home with his head on his shoulders,—if

[1] Pallad. Fusci Patav. ut supra, s. v. Tarsatica. As the work cannot be had easily, we will extract the passage. 'Ultra ad stadia centum et sexaginta occurrit Tarsatica oppidum, priùs Germanorum, cum omne, quod nunc flumen vocatur: hoc ipso, quo hæc condebam, a Venetis expugnatum et eversum. Ab eo mille non amplius passibus arx est in colle, in quam antiquum oppidi ipsius nomen translatum est. Habet quoque *fanum Beatæ Virginis miraculis celebre:* a flumine stadiis xl. est Buccatum celebre prope in littore; et *introrsus procul a mari totidem fermè stadiis Greglina castella familiæ Francapanum inter Illyricus nobilissimæ.* Hinc ad tercenta stadia est Senia, oppidum Regum Pannonia ubi *ter quotannis fit mercatum negotiatoribus undique convenientibus. . . .*' Evidently we are now engaged upon one of their wares! The date of this work appears from the preface.

[2] Katona, Rer. Hung. Hist. Andreas III. c. xxviii. A.D. 1294. And yet he was aware that Tersatz itself had no bishop belonging to it, but was in the diocese of Corbavo. Comp. Timon's Imag. Antiq. Hung. c. xvii.

[3] Vol. xix. p. 325. Where he got his information, however, he has not stated; but we find from M. Caillau, that it was the Jesuit Riera who was an eye-witness of their arrival. P. 48.

there are any, we repeat, who can believe this absolutely possible, and not wholly incredible, let them hear how a subsequent excavator belonging to the Franciscan convent of Nazareth has disposed of his reported investigations—the only historical notice that we can find of them apart from the legend. After having proved at large, and to his own satisfaction at all events, that *he* had been *the first* to discover the true ancient foundations of the house, he adds,—

'How those men who, in the time of Nicholas IV. (*i. e.* A. D. 1291), were sent to Nazareth for this purpose, managed to get their proofs from thence, I know not at all; since what we have now done, by the grace of God, in the way of experiment, *was absolutely impossible for them to have thus done in those days; nor, in fact, either at Nazareth, or at Loretto, does it appear what they did do. . . .*'[1]

We now come to the only really *objective* house in the story, still standing where it has ever stood, not 1900 years, but about 400 years old, the original Santa Casa, in whose honour the dutiful laurels about Loretto, till the ruthless axe had laid them low, in the words of the legend,[2] were perpetually bowing their heads! Not but that it, too, is stated to have been once locomotive, and possibly might have been still, had it not been luckily built over where it now stands. The story says that it made no less than three land flights before it became stationary. First, shepherds keeping their flocks by night, *as on the night of the Nativity*, saw it descend, amidst a blaze of light, in a wood of laurels near Recanati, in the march of Ancona. This, however, proved too dangerous a locality, owing to the robbers that infested it, to be attractive to pilgrims; so the angels, who had brought it thither, had the trouble of once more removing it to a neighbouring hill, about a mile off; and from thence, when it had proved an apple of discord to two brothers, joint owners of the spot on which it had lighted, it removed for the fourth and last time—thenceforward to fly no more—to the far more convenient resting-place of a plot of ground by the high-road; all which flights and final settlement were effected in the short space of a single year.[3] The question unfortunately remains, who are they that vouch for these particulars? We have appealed in vain to contemporaries, and echo still answers who? We are compelled to fall back upon the following note from Gieseler for the stern truth:—

'*The first writer who notices this sanctuary is Flavius Blondus*, secretary of Eugenius IV. (and the following Popes, till Pius II. ob. A. D. 1463), in his Italia Illustrata in Piceno, p. 339 (Op. ed. Basil, A. D. 1559):—

[1] Thomas a Novatia ap. Quaresmii Elucid. Terr. S. lib. vii. c. iv. ad fin.
[2] Caillau, p. 24.
[3] Caillau, pp. 20—33. The time occupied we learn from Raynald. Contin. ad Baron, A. D. 1295 (n. 59).

'"Recanatum inter et Adriacum mare, paululum a Musione recedit celeberrimum totius Italiæ, ut in aperto immunitoque vico, sacellum gloriosæ Virginis Mariæ in Laureto appellatum. Quo loco preces supplicantium a Deo genitricis suæ intercessione exaudiri, illud maximum certissimumque est argumentum, quòd eorum, qui votis emissis exauditi fuerunt, ex auro, argento, cerâ, pannis, veste lineâ, laneâque, appensa donaria, magno luenda pretio, basilicamque omnem pœnè complentia, Episcopus in Dei Virginisque gloriam intacta conservat."

'From this we may infer, that the wonderful removal was either wholly unknown, or only known as a popular tradition. *The first writer who mentions the account of this wonderful removal,* which is now found at the sanctuary itself, is *Baptista Mantuanus.* (Redemptoris mundi matris Eccl. Lauret. Hist. in ejusd. opp. omn. Antwerp, 1576, 8vo. tom. iv. p. 216, seq.) . . . . The account was undoubtedly written between 1450 and 1480, and was the means of spreading the story.'[1]

In other words, that this wonderful event, which, if true, stands unique in the history of the world, is not noticed in a single extant authentic document of any kind for two whole centuries; that there is not a Pope who even speaks of the shrine of Loretto for one hundred and fifty years,[2] and that then, when notice is first taken of it, it is successively mentioned by a Papal secretary and by Pontiffs themselves for some time afterwards, in high terms of praise, but without the most remote reference to that crowning event, which, if true, would have distinguished it far above all other Christian sanctuaries. And then, finally, that the first author who mentions the miraculous removal, happens to have been General of the Carmelites, an order, as he says himself, in connexion with the story which he is telling for the first time—'specially decorated with the title of the Mother of God;' while *his sole authority for it,* is, by his own candid confession, found to have been nothing more than '*a musty worm-eaten tablet,*' without date, affixed to the walls of the church itself, among other innumerable votive offerings, transcribed by him A.D. 1479, and dedicated to the then cardinal bishop of Recanati, nephew of Sixtus IV. of whom it is no less candidly testified that it was his aspiration to be adding continually to the majesty of the sanctuary.[3] The Carmelites, moreover,

---

[1] Gieseler, Eccl. Hist. vol. iii. § 144, p. 314, note. Eng. Tr. ed. Philadelphia, 1836. 8vo.

[2] Even M. Caillau cannot adduce one till Urban VI. A.D. 1389. But there is not such a Bull extant. The Bull, however, which is evidently meant is the first of Boniface IX. respecting the Feast of the Visitation of the blessed Virgin Mary, where it certainly might have been expected to have been noticed (Bullar, Rom. Caroli Coquel. tom. iii. pars ii. p. 378 and seq.) but is not. The votive inscription of Pius II. which of course we are not in a position to verify, is as silent about the removal as his predecessors were about the shrine: V. Caillau, p. 57, note. The bulls mentioned by him of subsequent Popes are not to be met with in the above collection.

[3] Baptist. Mantuan. loc. cit. pp. 216, 220, 221.

had just had it entrusted to their guardianship by the said Sixtus IV.[1]

Thus initiated, the wondrous tale passed rapidly from mouth to mouth and from ear to ear, and as it passed acquired consistency. It was soon elaborated out of documents of a more authentic cast: and the colophon was placed upon it, when Jerome Angelita (who flourished, not as M. Caillau most falsely asserts, A.D. 1378,[2] but towards the middle of the sixteenth century,[3]) published his very popular version of the story,[4] of which he asserted authentic proofs were to be seen in the public archives of his native town Recanati.

Proofs indeed were to be seen there—but what was the nature of the testimony upon which they rested? It is seldom that one finds writers on the marvellous telling their story with so much candour and *naïveté* as our friends the poet and the antiquarian. 'The *translation of the Holy House*,' says Jerome, '*was first de-*'*scribed in a picture on the new wall of the same*, painted at the 'public expense of the Recanatensians.' It found its way into writing subsequently from some annotations made on the picture by the guardian of the shrine (antistes cubiculi): a copy of which had been struck off, and was still handed about. Mantuanus, by the way, speaks of it.

All this, however, would seem to have passed off and to have been subsiding into oblivion, we are not told how long: when—'Unexpectedly, *in the days of Leo X.*' proceeds Jerome (that is, between A.D. 1513 and 1521), '*some Illyrians bring over a scroll* '(scheda) *extracted from the ancient records of a certain town on* '*the other side of the Adriatic, containing a full account of the first* '*translation.*' This intelligence was deemed so extraordinary that it was immediately notified to the Pope; and of course all Recanati was in a blaze. We would remind our readers that Leo X. is the first Pope who speaks of any Illyrian translation whatever, in express terms;[5] and that in his Bull, dated August 1st, A.D. 1518, he mentions all four translations in their due order. His munificence founded a college for twelve canons,

[1] Ibid. p. 222. Without imputing dishonesty to the Carmelite General, one need go no further than his own version of it to be quite convinced of the worthlessness of the legend. The practical moral is most naively given, pp. 225, 226.

[2] P. 53. Evidently confounding Clement VII., to whom Jerome dedicated his work, with the anti-pope, Clement VII. of Avignon notoriety.

[3] He was father of John Francis Angelita, the historian of Recanati, whose history was published by his friend and contemporary Caspar Garbeyza, A.D. 1601 v. ap. Thesaur. Antiquit. et Hist. Ital. a Grævio, tom. vii. pars ii. prope fin.

[4] Ibid. p. 13. The son says his father's book sold so, when translated, that he had been obliged to publish a second edition. The work of Torsellinus succeeded it, (v. ibid.) not preceded.

[5] The bull of *his predecessor Julius II.* most curiously makes the house *pass at once* from Nazareth to Recanati. v. Torsellin. Hist. Lauret. I. 9. ap. Martorelli Teat. Istor. tom. i. Why did not M. Caillau notice this in affecting to quote the bull as consistent in all respects with his history? p. 3, note, comp. p. 63.

twelve missionary priests, and six choristers, in the neighbourhood of the Holy House; and a pilgrimage to Loretto was by him raised to a level—in the way of gaining indulgences—with a visit to the principal churches of his own metropolis.[1] Jerome finishes his preface by saying that his own account (which could scarce have been composed within twenty years of these latter events) was taken from the ancient annals of Recanati, reduced into form, and illustrated by means of the scroll thus brought over from Illyria.[2]

We are now in a position to point out both the origin and growth of the tale. The first authority for it was the votive tablet discovered by the Mantuan bard, upon which explanatory notes had been written by the priest in charge of the sanctuary: which notes moreover existed in a separate and authentic copy. When it was first wafted over to the opposite coast does not appear, but it was brought from thence in the days of Leo X., who did not hesitate to stamp the whole with his authority, and to found a large collegiate establishment on the spot in honour of it. Some twenty years or more afterwards, Jerome Angelita published a popular version of it, taken, he says, partly from the public records of the town near which the shrine stood, and partly from documents brought over from a town in Illyria, which boasted of a fac-simile of the said shrine.

Jerome, notwithstanding, it will have been seen, appeals to the tablet beheld by the Mantuan bard, with the annotations that had been made upon it, as the earliest authority for the legend: and we may be sure that the Carmelite General transcribed them most fully. Whence then did the historian supply so many minute details that are wanting—and correct so many particulars that are awkwardly stated—in the poet? According to Baptista, that is, the tablet, the Holy House was removed from Fiume, because through ignorance or unskilfulness it was not regarded there with becoming reverence. It is thus that the vision of the bishop of S. George, the piety of Nicholas Frangipane, and the first and most distinguished embassy to Nazareth, are slurred over. All this Jerome doubtless supplied from the records of Tersatz! Was it likewise from those records of Tersatz that the dates of the three subsequent translations near Recanati were supplied so accurately? And did they correct the

[1] Caillau, pp. 65, 66.

[2] This, of course, together with the entire annals of Fiume are very conveniently said to have perished. Martorelli Teat. Istor. vol. iii. p. 31. fol. ed.; and a similar apology is made for the scantiness of the records of Recanati, Ibid. vol. i. p. 177. *i. e.* Torsell. Hist. Lauret. i. 22. We, too, should like to see much the records from which Jerome copied! By the way, where does Torsellinus get his authority 'Præp. Tere.' explained, c. 28, to have been the priest (to wit!) who made notes on the picture. Neither Baptista nor Jerome mention such a name in connexion with it; and according to the former, the priest before whom the depositions were taken was 'Neronianus,' not 'Teremannus.'

statement which Baptista Mantuanus has nevertheless handed down, that it was in A.D. 1386(!) only that the connexion of the House of Loretto with Nazareth was first revealed, and that messengers were despatched thereupon to the latter place, and all without a single word about Tersatz? Evidently there was something about the date that looked awkward; or something about the vision that seemed to put a slight upon Illyria. Unquestionably a different version of the whole circumstance might well have been expected from Jerome, as is indeed the case. According to him this second appearance of the blessed Virgin Mary is placed A.D. 1296: she is made to acquaint her votary with the first translation: and as a natural consequence, messengers are reported to have been sent not only to Nazareth, for the purpose of investigating the original site of the house, but to Tersatz, its resting-place.[1]

The splendid myth which M. Rohrbacher has inserted into his ecclesiastical history is embroidery work made up; the narrative of the Santa Casa by Jerome, the embroidery work itself: and the simple unvarnished legend in the hands of Baptista, the canvass that supports the whole, but is too coarse for inspection. By the candid avowal of the last two writers the substratum of the whole is found to have been the dingy tablet upon the *new wall* of the house, with notes appended to it by the priest who ministered there. And truly, why might not the devout inhabitants of Recanati have a picture expressly painted for the dear little chapel which they were restoring, and the artist indulge his fancy, and the priest endeavour to make the subject intelligible to his flock? But is it for this that we should be required to read the ancient Fathers backwards; making some say what they never said: and interpreting others short of their express statements: and casting reflections upon others indirectly, because they have passed over in silence what they ought to have noticed; and flying directly in the teeth of others, because they have made morally impossible that which we would fain believe to be a fact, even against their express testimony?

The first, and indeed only traveller to Nazareth who speaks of a house at all there, before the alleged translation, has been shown to be Phocas; and this is a subterraneous one within a cave—one which could never have been got out without a miracle, and a corresponding one to which is allowed to exist there still. The church which stood over it we know to have been utterly rased to the ground by the Saracens twenty-nine years after the alleged removal of the house, A.D. 1291; and

[1] More inconsistencies we do not think it necessary to point out. The individual testimonies that are alleged, lastly, are not only without date, but are self-contradictory.

every pilgrim without exception upon record, from the west, who went to Nazareth during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, speaks exclusively of the ruins of that which had been destroyed, without a word about the foundations of that which was *afterwards said* to have been miraculously removed. The first pilgrim who has made allusion to the latter cannot have flourished earlier than the commencement of the sixteenth century—some thirty years after Mantuanus had transcribed the legend—and in what terms does he refer to it? Just in the way that one might have anticipated from his very date!

'Here (speaking of Nazareth) is the very spot where the angel Gabriel announced the Incarnation of the Son of God to the blessed Virgin, but that chapel, *as is reported*, (ut fertur) has been translated by angels from that spot to Loretto. . . . .'[1]

Why! up to the very time of his pilgrimage Popes and their secretaries had spoken of the shrine in high terms as a most frequented one, but nothing more: its marvellous translations were unknown, or treated as a local dream, till that great vender of indulgences, Leo X., had placed his infallible seal upon them.

How much his infallible authority is worth, may be jndged from the evidence which has been laid before our readers—for they have now the whole—the whole, that is, of the evidence in favour of, or against, the story, that is to be gathered from history. Were we to go into other evidence, it might seem that we doubted about the decisive character of that which has been already adduced. Persons who prefer getting to their conclusions by a shorter cut, would probably deem ours a work of supererogation. They might point to the walls of the sanctuary, and say with M. Saussure that they 'perfectly resembled' the red stone of which the poorer cottages about Ancona,[2] and we have been told upon equally trustworthy authority, about Assisi, are built; or they might have taken exception to the chimney, with the Abbé Michon,[3] and said that no such thing throughout Palestine was ever heard of attached to a house. Admitting the walls of the house to be of stone, not brick,[4] they

[1] Cauis. Thesaur. Monum. Eccl. ed. Basnage, vol. iv. p. 776. His work, according to Basnage, was written A.D. 1509.

[2] Observats. sur la Physique, par l'Abbé Rozier, tom. vii. Janvier, 1776, p. 32. It is part of a letter to the Chevalier Hamilton, Eng. Ambassador at Naples, and dated Dec. 17, A.D. 1774.

[3] Voyage Rel. vol. ii. notes, p. 3.

[4] See Quarterly Review, Sept. 1853. Art. 'Holy Places,' p. 442; and so M. Saussure—Abbé Michon, on the other hand, says 'brick,' and so the earlier Protestant controversialists. So likewise the Russian traveller, Basil Gregorivich Barsky, between A.D. 1723 and 1747. His testimony is the more curious, as he is a firm believer in the holy house of Loretto in the first part of his journey; but when he gets to Nazareth he says he finds he must cancel all that he had previously said of

might have still investigated the hills round Nazareth themselves, and found that the native stone of the country (and of which all houses are built) was grey (not red) lime-stone.[1] Once more, with Quaresmius, and indeed all travellers, they might advert to the fact, that the actual spot of the Annunciation is still shown at Nazareth as well as Loretto; or, finally, with the eloquent writer in a recent Quarterly, they might point to the utter impossibility of amalgamating the grotto which has been connected with it at Nazareth, with 'any such appendage as the Santa Casa.' Each one of these is an awkward objection; all together may be thought well-nigh irrefragable. To many minds, therefore, it may seem superfluous to have insisted so long upon the historical one. But, indeed, when the truthfulness of history has been tampered with to the extent that it has been in the present instance, its vindication almost partakes of the character of a sacred duty. Besides, would that we could add that the merits of the question were purely historical; that it was a point simply in which the authority of Fleury[2] and of Berault Bercastel, who repudiate the story, had been abandoned for that of the Abbé Rohrbacher, who accepts it with enthusiasm. It is a fiction that has exercised and is still exercising more practical influence throughout western Christendom, than the most plain precepts of the Gospel. For every one that abstains habitually from violating any single command in the Decalogue, there are thousands who year by year make a pilgrimage to Loretto, and tens of thousands who have the will and desire to do so were they able. It has amassed treasures that would have fed almost the entire poor of Europe for their lives.[3] It has extorted homage from Erasmus,[4] from Descartes,[5] and in our own days from Dr. Newman![6] Into it has been introduced the purest of virgins and holiest of mothers, for the purpose of stamping with her authority the clumsiest as well as the falsest of all legends. It forms, finally, the sixth Lection of a special office set forth by Papal infallibility, and by no means

---

it; as all the houses there are built of the *native grey stone*, and not a single brick is to be seen in the country. Hence, Roman Catholics are apt to think that they have satisfied the objection, when they have shown it to be of stone and not brick. (Barsky's Travels to the Holy Places. S. Petersburg, 6th ed. A. D. 1819. Pages 39 and seq. and 347 and seq.) Whereas, on the contrary, it may be granted not only that the house is of stone, but that a kind of stone with red streaks or veins in it is found in Palestine; what is denied, is, that any such *red-brick-like* stone as that of the house is found there.

[1] Quarterly Review, and Abbé Michon, as before.

[2] Quoted by M. Gosselin, p. 457, note.

[3] M. Caillau, pp. 166—204. Comp. Moore's Italy, Letter xxxii.

[4] M. Caillau, pp. 353—359, inserts a mass which Erasmus actually composed in honour of it.

[5] Ibid. p. 143, where his pilgrimage is recorded.

[6] See l'Univers above.

obsolete, in which Almighty God is venerated for a miraculous exercise of His power, which, according to the framers of the story, clearly ought to have been exerted, but in point of fact never was! Actually, while the seventh Lection consists of a portion of the first chapter of S. Luke's Gospel, in the preceding one—as it were to illustrate the contrast between light and darkness—what follows is assumed to be no less trustworthy![1]

'The house in which this Virgin was born, hallowed by the divine mysteries, and snatched by the ministry of angels out of the hand of the infidel, was translated first into Dalmatia, and afterwards into the territory of Loretto, in the province of Picenum, during the pontificate of the holy Celestine V. And it is proved to be the very one in which the Word was made Flesh and dwelt amongst us, as well by papal diplomas and the abundant veneration of the whole world, as also by the constant power of miracles and the grace of heavenly benefits. Whereupon Innocent XII., moved by these things, in order that the faithful might be the more effectually stirred up, and put in mind of the worship of our most beloved mother, gave directions to celebrate, with Mass and office appropriate, the translation of the said holy house, which is observed throughout the whole province of Picenum with anniversary solemnity.'[2]

What a train of melancholy reflections is thus afforded by December 10th. The largest portion of Christendom by far insisting upon Papal infallibility as a vital principle; Papal infallibility thus solemnly pledged to an untruth; so many devout Christians, lastly, thus pledged to a system where belief in an untruth may be said to be morally necessary to their religious growth! Equally deplorable, too, is the association of the blessed Virgin Mary with a story so false! Can this be the way to attest our gratitude or revere her memory? How purely rationalistic in principle (though veiled under the mask of authority) are the 'pious beliefs' with which the Church of Rome teems, professedly in her honour! What are the real grounds upon which the Santa Casa, together with her Assumption and Immaculate Conception,[3] rest? Revelation, or the consent of antiquity, or authentic history? Nothing of the kind. Neither can with the least justice be pleaded in behalf of either. It would be safer, indeed, not to risk their verdict. Upon what grounds, then, are they based? Professedly upon authority? but what

[1] Benedict XIV. admits that it was fully discussed in the Congregation of Rites before it was appended to the office, by authority of Innocent XII. A.D. 1699—so that by it the Church of Rome stands pledged to the miracle. Op. tom. ix. De Festis B. V. M., lib. ii. 16. 1. The Apostolical (*i. e.* Papal) Constitutions, of which he makes so much in the next section, are neither given at length, nor (excepting that of Sixtus V.) is it said where they are to be found in the passage to which he refers, De Servor. Dei Beatif. and Beat. Can. lib. iv. pars ii. c. 10. § 11. and *N. B.* it is there said that the whole responsibility of the truth of the legend rests on them.

[2] Caillau, p. 371, and seq.

[3] See the account given of the rise, *e. g.* of the last of these, Fleury, E. H. B. xci. c. 29, A.D. 1308; and Duns Scotus frankly admits that he is arguing against the common opinion!

are the arguments that have swayed authority? A pious sorites, or logical illumination! S, Mary must have lived in a house. S. Luke in fact has said as much. This house must have been dear to her as the scene of the Annunciation. It must have been dear to the Saviour equally, for the same reason. As such, it must have been likewise dear to the Apostles. Where would S. Mary love to pass most of her time after the ascension, but there? Where would the Apostles meet most frequently, but there? and they could scarce have met without breaking bread. Would not the said house have been equally dear to their successors? Would not a special Providence have watched over it; a house, the scene of a mystery without parallel, would it have been allowed to perish with other houses? How much more consonant to piety to believe that it was removed by angels, than that it was overthrown by infidels!

Such a train of reasoning, never otherwise than attractive, would have found innumerable votaries in a locality like that of the shores of the Adriatic, before the moral effects of the fall of Acre had passed away. There, perhaps, of all Europe, minds were likely to have been most impressed with them. Henceforward those coasts ceased to be the rendezvous of kings and pilgrims, of warriors and ecclesiastics, banded together in a mixed mass, but all bound for the Holy Land. Venetian fleets were no longer under the necessity of scouring those coasts, for the purpose of protecting or of impeding a Crusade. Pilgrimages to the East were for the moment paralysed. The conquests of Godfrey de Bouillon had all been forfeited. It was a fact, that Christianity no longer existed in the land that gave birth to Christ and His Apostles. No longer could sins be cancelled, or indulgences obtained, or enthusiasm rewarded by a visit to the Holy Sepulchre.

What fruitful topics, both of conversation and of sad reflection, must these have been for some time between Venice and Ancona on the one hand, and between Fiume and Ragusa on the other hand (for these were the localities that were affected most), from A.D. 1291 downwards. And how is it that men console themselves for the long-continued absence of a much-loved object? Their best solace is to be found in the imitative arts of painting and poetry; through these they may manage to give vent to their feelings; through these they may manage, at least in some sense, to realize what they no longer possess. Where they can, they paint from sight or memory; where they can do neither, they supply the void from imagiuation. Instances of the former kind and to the point are to be found in the Calvary, as it is called, of Lombardy, the Jerusalem of

Italy,[1] or still more literally, the Campo Santo of Pisa;[2] not, indeed, that they are by any means wanting in connexion with the Santa Casa. In earlier days, as is intimated in the legend itself, it gave rise to the twin shrine near Fiume; in our own times we need not go further than the chapel of the Seminary of S. Sulpice near Paris, in order to see a complete fac-simile of the original. Instances of the latter kind are to be found in the numerous conceptions of the Holy Family by a Raphael or Corregio. How exquisitely truthful all of them are! but who would dream of asserting that the scenes which they describe were authentic history? All which is equally applicable to the house of Loretto. It was evidently the rude production of some native architect, and the object of which was to bring Nazareth vividly into remembrance. It is exquisitely described in the *Quarterly*, as 'the petrifaction of the last sigh of the Crusades.' The groundwork of his idea was without doubt taken from S. Luke; for the details he had nothing to guide him but his own simple imagination; and the result was the house.[3] By the process of reasoning already described, it was soon transformed into the original house. Nazareth had once been the dwelling-place of the blessed Virgin Mary; her house never could have been destroyed; her house must have been removed; her house was here; where was it, if it was not here? Some asked, how did it come? Imagination once more travailled. By the time that the house needed repair, a new conception had emerged, that for elegance and spirituality far exceeded that of the architect. In the picture designed for the new wall, the house was seen coursing above the ocean in mid-air, borne on the wings of angels! The picture without doubt caused universal admiration; the priest put the whole into writing; and gradually it came to be considered authentic history. The object of our inquiry has been to contrast it with authentic history, and of the result we conceive there can be but one opinion—even papal authorization cannot create a fact!

We commend the moral to be drawn from this one instance of popular teaching and belief in the Church of Rome, stamped with papal authority, commemorated in a solemn office before God yearly, joined to the very commemoration of the death of His Son, and yet false in fact, to the attention of all serious Roman Catholics; it is not, indeed, that we take a pride in exposing what we had far sooner did not exist. But we would

[1] Quarterly Review as before, p. 443.

[2] Watkins's Travels. Letter xvi. vol. i. p. 315.

[3] Something like this was the view of the learned Benedictine, Dom. Calmet (see his Dictionary); but Mansi, who translated his work into Latin, expunged the passage. So much for the freedom of doubting the legend in the Church of Rome! Bened. XIV., Op. ix. De Festis, B. V. M. lib. ii. c. 16, § 11.

address ourselves particularly to those who, with the *Rambler*, admit the religious movement in England of the last few years to have been, as far as they are concerned, or may be supposed numerical gainers by it, a downright failure; and we rejoice to find that it is considered a just cause of inquiry amongst them. We rejoice that Roman Catholics are at length conscious of, and anxious to account for, the fact, that 'whatever in England is 'most serious, whatever is most candid, whatever is best in-'formed as to the Bible, as to religious doctrine and ecclesias-'tical history, keeps itself apart from them with a jealous 'horror.'[1] . . . We rejoice to have their candid avowal that 'controversy' will only 'convert tens' where they had 'thought it would convert thousands.'[2] . . We are rejoiced to find it pro-pounded unhesitatingly that, 'If England is to be *converted*, it 'will be by the declaration of the doctrines of the Catholic faith 'as the word of God to save men's souls.'[3] . . . by such an exhi-'bition of the truths of religion as may go to the root of the 'mischief, lay bare the secrets of the diseased heart to the 'awakening conscience, and bring the whole man, body, soul, 'and spirit, humbled as a sinner before the throne of God, or, 'rather let us say, before the foot of the Cross . . . It is before 'God dying on the Cross for *them* that they will yield' . . The 'conscience will learn what sin is, what God is, what heaven 'and hell are, what the sinner must do to be saved, and to 'whom he must have recourse as the ministers of recon-'ciliation.'[5] . . .

What better programme indeed could be sketched out for a missionary priest? We trust that there is not a single missionary that leaves our shores—may we not add, a single clergyman that ministers to the wants of our home population?—who does not endeavour to carry out to the letter what is here commended. And yet Englishmen have a right to expect something more from Rome: they have a right to expect, on the one hand, express authoritative disclaimers upon points where they have just cause to doubt her sincerity; and they have a right to expect, on the other hand, that the discipline which may have been deemed advisable in a barbarous age, shall not be continued to be imposed upon a well-educated, enlightened people. Englishmen are loyal subjects; they read their Bible; they can communicate in a church without irreverence; they love their mother-tongue; they love ingenuousness; above all things, they love the truth. They will never part with any one of these characteristics, even to be one with Rome! Let it be declared authoritatively that the pope no longer claims the

[1] Rambler, January, 1851. Art. i. p. 10. [2] Ibid. p. 9.
[3] Ibid. p. 12. [4] Ibid. p. 16. [5] Ibid. p. 17.

power of dethroning kings; that the beautiful service of the Mass is no longer to be made a secret of in a foreign tongue; that equivocation and mental reservation are unequivocally condemned; that legends are not to be confounded with authentic history—still less any doctrine or necessary observance built upon them; let all this be done in a generous spirit, and who will assert that in England, of all countries in the world, it will not be reciprocated?

But till then we cannot doubt for a moment but that Roman Catholics will continue to be looked upon by whatever in England is 'most serious,' 'most candid,' 'best informed as to the Bible, as to religious doctrine and ecclesiastical history,' with 'a jealous horror.' Yes, and the longer that it is delayed, will their 'horror' increase proportionably; for England, we trust, is not going to lapse back into barbarism; and never will Englishmen be persuaded to think favourably of a religious system, in which authority—to go no further than the present instance—claiming to be infallible, persists in upholding a palpable untruth.

obvious, that cathedral naves are not at present used as places of religious worship. It is, of course, competent to any sect mentioned in the list to make better use of opportunities than hitherto, but if the Church herself takes no account of cathedral naves, as serviceable for public worship, we can hardly expect a secular officer to indulge in any statements founded on another principle.

These considerations, and no doubt several more, have had a tendency to depreciate the powers and usefulness of the Church in the present Census; but, if it is remembered that the present is the first attempt at anything of the kind, and that the questions were in the first place framed without any experience of what could be answered, and what distinctions could be made, and therefore that original intentions had to be departed from, because the questions were not sufficiently explicit, we think that on the whole the Church of England may accept the general results as not a very untrue picture. The attempt (to adduce an instance of failure in the questions asked) to obtain a return of incomes was altogether abandoned; again, the distinction between free and appropriated sittings was so variously understood by the officers of different places of worship, as to render this column of but little value, or to leave but a general presumption, that those said to be appropriated were much more really so, and were, in proportion to the numbers, of far more value than those under the more indefinite head of free, or, as in many cases was meant, simply unlet.

One distinction contemplated in the formula we regret was not observed, though it would probably have told very much to the disadvantage of the Church: we mean the separate enumeration of Sunday schools. Numerically, the crowds of little children who are driven to all our churches, make an imposing effect if classed with the rest of the congregation, but the distinction between the one and the other is so considerable in any estimate we should form of the Church's real strength in a place, that great allowances must be made. And this applies more to our own Church than to many other sects, with which the attendance of Sunday scholars is not so uniform an accompaniment of public worship as in our morning and afternoon services. It is common indeed with dissenters to have Sunday schools open during the whole afternoon, the children of which are consequently not attending public worship. We would illustrate the effect of this by the parish of Mary-le-bone. The number of attendants in the various churches was 19,305 at morning service, and in the evening only 7,649. In such a district, however, it is probable that the evening adult congregations were far more important, as compared with the morning, than would here be

implied. In explanation of this discrepancy, we find the afternoon attendance to have been 6,537, nearly equal to the evening, whereas it is well known that the afternoon adult congregations in London are very small as compared with those of the evening. The presumption, therefore, is, that the afternoon congregations consisted chiefly of children, who had swelled out the morning numbers by the same amount, but left the adults to themselves in the evening. In the same district, the morning congregations of all other religious bodies were about 15,000, while the afternoon were under 2,000, 1,300 of whom were Roman Catholics and Irvingites, and the evening ones were 10,000. Here then it is obvious that our method of dealing with Sunday schools is to the apparent advantage of the Church in the Census Tables. The same result is seen in the parish of S. Pancras; among dissenters the morning and evening congregations are more equal, while in the churches there are large congregations in the morning, which seem to be afterwards divided into afternoon congregations of children, and evening of adults, producing in the total about the same number as the morning lists.

Without in this place enumerating any further imperfections in the actual statistics before us, but rather commending the whole production as a great fact, from which each cause and interest must derive its own benefit, making its own corrections, we shall direct attention to the Report by which these statistics are introduced.

This Report is of considerable length, and bears the impression of having been drawn up with great care and labour, as well as with a praiseworthy anxiety to perform so important a public work with all the energy and zeal which the author could command. It has not been done by one whose only ambition is to get through, in a respectable manner, an arduous task; but it is the work of a mind more anxious to exceed than to fall short of its appointed task. He looks forward to his words being read throughout Europe, and therefore occasionally is more explicit than would be necessary in writing only for his own countrymen; and, for the benefit of this extended circulation, he deals in doctrinal summaries and historical abstracts, which are often delicate ground. Indeed, it rather took us by surprise to find the official Census of 1851 prefaced by a history of the religion of England, methodically commencing with the age of the Druids, and boldly rushing on through every doubtful period of the Church's annals,—abounding in broadly stated assertions about individuals and classes, and stamping, as it were, with the Registrar-General's seal, a certain random abstract of popular notions on the history and doctrines of our Church. We are disposed to leave other sects to deal with

obvious, that cathedral naves are not at present used as places of religious worship. It is, of course, competent to any sect mentioned in the list to make better use of opportunities than hitherto, but if the Church herself takes no account of cathedral naves, as serviceable for public worship, we can hardly expect a secular officer to indulge in any statements founded on another principle.

These considerations, and no doubt several more, have had a tendency to depreciate the powers and usefulness of the Church in the present Census; but, if it is remembered that the present is the first attempt at anything of the kind, and that the questions were in the first place framed without any experience of what could be answered, and what distinctions could be made, and therefore that original intentions had to be departed from, because the questions were not sufficiently explicit, we think that on the whole the Church of England may accept the general results as not a very untrue picture. The attempt (to adduce an instance of failure in the questions asked) to obtain a return of incomes was altogether abandoned; again, the distinction between free and appropriated sittings was so variously understood by the officers of different places of worship, as to render this column of but little value, or to leave but a general presumption, that those said to be appropriated were much more really so, and were, in proportion to the numbers, of far more value than those under the more indefinite head of free, or, as in many cases was meant, simply unlet.

One distinction contemplated in the formula we regret was not observed, though it would probably have told very much to the disadvantage of the Church: we mean the separate enumeration of Sunday schools. Numerically, the crowds of little children who are driven to all our churches, make an imposing effect if classed with the rest of the congregation, but the distinction between the one and the other is so considerable in any estimate we should form of the Church's real strength in a place, that great allowances must be made. And this applies more to our own Church than to many other sects, with which the attendance of Sunday scholars is not so uniform an accompaniment of public worship as in our morning and afternoon services. It is common indeed with dissenters to have Sunday schools open during the whole afternoon, the children of which are consequently not attending public worship. We would illustrate the effect of this by the parish of Mary-le-bone. The number of attendants in the various churches was 19,305 at morning service, and in the evening only 7,649. In such a district, however, it is probable that the evening adult congregations were far more important, as compared with the morning, than would here be

implied. In explanation of this discrepancy, we find the afternoon attendance to have been 6,537, nearly equal to the evening, whereas it is well known that the afternoon adult congregations in London are very small as compared with those of the evening. The presumption, therefore, is, that the afternoon congregations consisted chiefly of children, who had swelled out the morning numbers by the same amount, but left the adults to themselves in the evening. In the same district, the morning congregations of all other religious bodies were about 15,000, while the afternoon were under 2,000, 1,300 of whom were Roman Catholics and Irvingites, and the evening ones were 10,000. Here then it is obvious that our method of dealing with Sunday schools is to the apparent advantage of the Church in the Census Tables. The same result is seen in the parish of S. Pancras; among dissenters the morning and evening congregations are more equal, while in the churches there are large congregations in the morning, which seem to be afterwards divided into afternoon congregations of children, and evening of adults, producing in the total about the same number as the morning lists.

Without in this place enumerating any further imperfections in the actual statistics before us, but rather commending the whole production as a great fact, from which each cause and interest must derive its own benefit, making its own corrections, we shall direct attention to the Report by which these statistics are introduced.

This Report is of considerable length, and bears the impression of having been drawn up with great care and labour, as well as with a praiseworthy anxiety to perform so important a public work with all the energy and zeal which the author could command. It has not been done by one whose only ambition is to get through, in a respectable manner, an arduous task; but it is the work of a mind more anxious to exceed than to fall short of its appointed task. He looks forward to his words being read throughout Europe, and therefore occasionally is more explicit than would be necessary in writing only for his own countrymen; and, for the benefit of this extended circulation, he deals in doctrinal summaries and historical abstracts, which are often delicate ground. Indeed, it rather took us by surprise to find the official Census of 1851 prefaced by a history of the religion of England, methodically commencing with the age of the Druids, and boldly rushing on through every doubtful period of the Church's annals,—abounding in broadly stated assertions about individuals and classes, and stamping, as it were, with the Registrar-General's seal, a certain random abstract of popular notions on the history and doctrines of our Church. We are disposed to leave other sects to deal with

their own doctrines as here defined; but we cannot forbear noticing, on our own parts, what now goes forth to the world as an authorized account of the whole position of our Church.

It is first stated that there are, 'thirty-five different religions in England and Wales—twenty-seven native, and nine foreign;'—which looks like thirty-six. The former are principally subdivisions of the four great non-conforming bodies, known under the titles of Presbyterians, Independents, Baptists, and Methodists, together with the Society of Friends, Unitarians, Moravians, Glassites, New Church, and Brethren. Among the latter are some small congregations of foreign Protestants; but the only important sect, in respect of numbers, is the Roman Catholic Church. The list concludes with 'the Catholic and Apostolic Church,' the Latter-day Saints, and the Jews, these three being apparently difficult of classification, and altogether rather unmanageable.

As popular misconceptions are entertained of the tenets of these various bodies, Mr. Mann attempts to set each before the public in its true colours, commencing this large subject with the landing of Cæsar on the coast of Britain. After a short notice of Jupiter and Apollo, and then of the Druids, he arrives at the introduction of Christianity, giving various opinions as to when this took place, and the degree of influence possessed by the Church during the first centuries of the Christian era. The tribute given to the ancient British Church is fair and satisfactory. Its early struggles and its independence of Rome are acknowledged, though but few details of its history can be given. The tide of Saxon paganism drove, however, these early fruits of the Christian religion into Cornwall and Wales; and England, for a time, worshipped those different conceptions of divinity, which have by a singular fate left their trace in the names by which we distinguish the days of the week, and even the great Christian festival of Easter.

But the Sun, Moon, Woden, Friga, and Eostre, all in their turn, were banished from the island as objects of worship, and the Church was again triumphant. The landing of S. Augustine and his forty coadjutors, in the year 596, gradually prepared the way for the universal acknowledgment of the Christian religion about 681. The history of the Saxon Church, its unceasing efforts at national freedom, its methodical ordering of ecclesiastical rules and canons, need not be here discussed; nor shall we be drawn too far into the general subject of Church history by any such comments as the following, on a critical portion of our history, about which no one probably ever thought of consulting even the Registrar-General, much less his deputed officer:—

'Even the capacity and energy of Henry II. were unable to restrain the progress of ecclesiastical dominion; and his contest with A'Becket, though commenced under favourable auspices, and prosecuted for some time with spirit and sagacity, was ultimately terminated only by defeat and concession; the Constitutions of Clarendon—by which, amongst other things, the separate clerical tribunals were abolished, all appeals to Rome forbidden, and episcopal appointments made dependent on the king's approval—were virtually inoperative, and Henry was himself obliged, as an atonement for A'Becket's murder, in some degree to promise never to enforce them. It is evident that at this time the great strength of the papacy lay in its hold upon the popular veneration: the people hitherto had nearly always sympathised with clerical resistance to the crown: A'Becket was received on his return from exile with unbounded demonstrations of respect, and his tomb was yearly visited by thousands upon thousands who regarded him as a martyr and a saint.'—*Census of Great Britain*, p. xx.

Nor, again, is it necessary, with those who have read the last number of this periodical, to consider whether the following passage is a fair representation of the doctrinal views advocated by Wycliffe:—

'Apart from his assaults on clerical delinquency, he seems to have maintained that the authority of the king and the civil power was superior to that of the pope; that the state had the right to deal with misapplied Church property; that Christ alone was the head of the Church; that there were only two scriptural orders, viz. priests and deacons; that the Scripture was the sole rule of faith; that justification was by faith and the influence of the Holy Spirit; that baptism is not essential to salvation, nor can it confer grace or take away sin; that tithes are a purely voluntary offering, and ought not to be enforced by penalties.'—P. xxi.

The period of the Reformation is made the occasion of a singular mixture of axioms and statements, on the part of this Church historian, while in discharge of his official duties in the *Home department*. It is said:—

'*All* parties in the state appear to have been agreed that it was the duty of the head of the Church to distinguish truth from error, and thus frame the Church's creed; and also, this accomplished, that it was the duty of the civil power to enforce professed reception of the creed thus authorized. The only questions were (1) *who* was the proper head of the Church; and (2) *what* were the doctrines which ought to be enforced.'—P. xxii.

A noble answer is at hand:—

'The Parliament and Convocation gave, in 1534, their answer to the former question by declaring, in indefinite but comprehensive language, that the *king* was the supreme head of the Church in England. From 1534 this country, therefore, may be said to have possessed a National Church; for ever since, with the brief exception which occurred in the reign of Mary, all the civil laws by which, in England, Christianity has been established and expounded, have derived their force entirely from the sanction of the native government of the state, apart from any, the slightest, interference of a foreign power.'—P. xxii.

The alternatives of King or Pope are here, it would seem, inclusive of the whole case. No Home Church government is

recognised as a possible third contingency; nor is the position of the Church allowed to be in the least different under Elizabeth.

'Elizabeth at once replaced the Church in the position it had occupied before the reign of Mary. Parliament again affirmed the sovereign's supremacy as head of the Church, and punished with extreme severity all those who questioned this prerogative.'—P. xxiv.

Mr. Mann, however, being perfectly aware that this confirmation of the title, 'head of the Church,' is historically untrue, having indeed been wholly discarded, introduces the following note at the foot of the page by way of explanation :—

'The queen preferred the title of "supreme governor" of the Church to "supreme head." All the bishops except one refused to take the oath, and were in consequence deprived; 178 of the inferior clergy imitated their refusal, with a similar result.'—*Ibid.*

But why make the assertion, if so immediately to correct it?

The Church being thus quietly disposed of, as an appendage of the State, the remainder of the historical portion of the Preface consists in describing the various results of the fact, that 'Protestant Christianity was reestablished as the national religion.'

'It followed, almost of necessity, that multitudes, deriving their opinions from the exercise of private judgment on the Scriptures recently unsealed to them, and urged, by natural reaction, to the utmost distance from the Church of Rome, would find their ardent expectations of the new establishment unrealized, and would lament as well the absence from its constitution and its ritual of much which they desired, as the continued presence there of much which they disliked.'—P. xxv.

The rise of Puritanism is then discussed, with a justly introduced allusion to the persecutions suffered by that body, as well as by the Papists, under Elizabeth's Church government. The brief triumph and the overthrow of Puritanism are then reviewed; and the final settlement of the Established Church at the Revolution, since which 'not the slightest change has been effected in the Church itself, in its doctrines, polity, or worship,' is made coincident with 'the birth-day of religious sects.' The government of the Church is thus concisely described, keeping up, it may be seen, the previous idea:—

'The government of the Church is virtually committed to the sovereign, as its temporal head, and to parliament, as the monarch's council; the Convocation of the clergy, which, in former times, was used to legislate on all ecclesiastical affairs, has not, since 1717, been permitted to deliberate to any purpose. The Crown appoints the archbishops, bishops, and deans, and a considerable portion of the clergy.'—P. xxxvii.

From the Revolution to the present century it is remarked, some truth, that a very brief description of the Church is ent. This is a period of but little extension and but little ty; a dreary waste in her history, during which her strength

lay in the retirement of a few righteous, who were then, as in all times of deadness, left to be witnesses to her life, rather than in her struggles at general utility. Indeed it is a reflection which ought not to be passed over, though some might use it with a hostile spirit, that if we trace the history of our Church from the Reformation itself to the present century, there are but few evidences of its ever being the religion of the people. That division of the Church was a shock that has made her quiver to her very foundation. The purity of her doctrines has too often been the cleanliness of desertion; while her freedom from superstition has been partly attributable to the lack of faith in her spiritual functions, on the part of the mass of her children, rather than from a well-directed confidence in her maternal guidance. Elizabeth had to check Puritanism, and induce attendance at church, by the fine of a shilling; after a brief interval of but a generation, Charles had to pay with his head for his support of Episcopacy, and for a time the Church even nominally ceased to be *national*. Charles and James following her reestablishment, have not left behind them very solid or satisfactory fruits even of a temporary turn in the Church's favour; and since the Revolution, it is but too true that schismatics have had a great share of the religious interests of the people, while the temporalities of the Church have been misused for private ends. How few of those memorials of affection which testify, in the language of Church architecture or decoration, to the zeal of her members, are left to us from these long periods, except the erection of family pews to the exclusion of the poor, and the occasional emblazonment of family monuments! We say not this from the love of disparagement, but because we can now afford to look the truth in the face, and it is better to do so. Let us boldly acknowledge that our Church never has recovered the allegiance of her people, or gained back their confidence, once so shaken at the Reformation era, and that the past three centuries have been but a transition from one state of things to another, during which she has maintained indeed her true vitality, as witnessed by many holy men and great theologians, but has failed to organise the religion of the country after her type and by her precepts. Such is the impression which a cursory review of the history of our Church, such an one as Mr. Mann has compiled, seems naturally to leave behind it. On some points he is undoubtedly biassed against certain aspects of ecclesiastical independence, such as others might think essential to a restored activity, but, in matters of fact, there is too much truth in the picture he gives; nor has the Church any cause to complain of her late efforts not being recognised. He speaks of the 'wonderful—almost unparalleled—achievements, in the way of self-extension, by which she has lately proved her inexhaustible

'vitality.' This prominent character so justly attributed to the present action of the Church, is suggestive also of future success, in gaining the hearts of the people, to some extent proportionate with the efforts made; if these are *unparalleled*, there is at any rate no past experience of failure to discourage us.

The progress of the Church of England during the last twenty years, in building and restoring churches, has been of a kind that, in spite of the much talked-of evil of party spirit now so dominant, will mark these years, for ages to come, as a period of great energy. From 1801 to 1811 the number of churches built was only 55 in England and Wales; during the next ten years it increased to 97; between 1821 and 1831 the number was 276; between the last date and 1841 the number swells out to 667; and in the ten years preceding the last census, to 1,197. This does not, however, at all represent the amount that has been done, for many more churches have been restored and vastly improved in all their arrangements than have been actually built. The funds by which these churches have been built also afford an instructive comparison between official grants from the Crown and voluntary benefactions. During the first thirty years of the century 500 churches were built, at a cost of 3,000,000*l.*, 1,152,000*l.* being from public funds, and the remainder private benefactions. During the following twenty years there have been no public grants for fresh undertakings within the period, yet five million and a half has been spent, and 2,029 churches built. Churches built by the Commissioners, between 1818 and 1831, cost on an average 10,000*l.* each, a fact which is partly accounted for by the price of materials, but which leaves a large balance for mismanagement, and affords a very good argument in favour of the economy of private benefactions, as well as their superiority in affording an index of real and self-sacrificing personal zeal. The principal counties where this great number of churches has been built are of course the metropolitan and manufacturing. In these districts, great as has been the increase of the population, the number of churches has more than kept up with it. In the year 1831, in Lancashire there was one church to 4,578 people; in 1851, we find this number reduced to 3,899; and about the same improvement is observable in Cheshire, Middlesex, Surrey, and the West Riding of Yorkshire, though if the whole country is taken into calculation, the proportion is slightly altered in the other direction. To show also the recent activity of the Church in other ways, a list of Societies is given, by which it appears that those con-

ted with the Church raise 400,000*l.*, out of which 250,000*l.*

plied to foreign Missionary operations.

ere Mr. Mann chiefly fails is in attempting definitions of ie. We accept on the whole his statistics, as being useful,

and perhaps as true as might have been expected: considering, that is, they were collected in the most unsatisfactory way, by the return of the parties most interested. We do not charge him, therefore, with unfair partiality when occupied with his own deputed province of work; indeed the mass of figures collected would be rather stubborn material for the impress, in their raw state, of any individual bias, unless we imputed direct dishonesty, than which nothing would be more unjust; but we nevertheless think it unfortunate that he should have attempted to act as a sort of pioneer of the Evangelical Alliance, in announcing that 'the doctrines of the Congregational Churches '(Independents) are almost identical with those embodied in the 'Articles of the Church of England, interpreted according to 'their Calvinistic meaning,—and that the fundamental doctrines 'of the Reformation, as embodied in the standards of the Church 'of England, are professed and preached by nineteen-twentieths 'of the Non-conforming Protestant community.' The assertion, again, that Calvin's doctrines were derived from Augustine, and were almost unquestioned in our Church till the seventeenth century, is at least open to objection, which it is right should be met by a theologian before so broadly stated in the following passage, which we give at length, as illustrative of the manner in which these questions are here treated:[1]—

'The first grand truth asserted, or rather re-asserted, at the Reformation, as the first-fruit of the exercise of private judgment, was that of "Justification by Faith;" or the sufficiency, for salvation, of repentance and belief in the atonement of Christ, apart from the performance by the penitent of any fancied meritorious works. In elucidation of this truth, the earliest reformers, and conspicuously Calvin, (following the example of Augustine in the ancient Church) affirmed that such repentance and belief could not, in consequence of man's entire depravity, be caused in any person by his own volition; but, if manifest at all, must be the effect of a special exercise of heavenly grace. They also held that the subjects of this favour are a limited class, predestinated from eternity to be redeemed, and safe from any final lapse. These tenets were received in all the churches of the Reformation, and prevailed, almost unquestioned, until near the termination of the 16th century. They were adopted, in their most important features, by the Church of England, and engrafted in her Articles. From their most distinguished advocate they gained the name of *Calvinism*, and all persons who professed them were denominated *Calvinists*. Before the beginning of the 17th century, however, a reaction was discernible, the aim of which was to assign a greater share of agency to man's free-will in the work of his redemption. Arminius (following the example of Pelagius in the ancient Church) maintained that men are able to accept or to reject the offer of divine favour when made to them; and that this offer is made to all, and not exclusively to the elect. These sentiments made gradual progress in the Church of England, and were generally preponderant among the clergy in the time of Archbishop Laud. From their most distinguished teacher, they

[1] For a refutation of this popular fallacy and a full discussion of the subject, see the article, 'Recent Arguments on Baptismal Regeneration,' in the Christian Remembrancer of January 1850.

obtained the appellation of *Arminianism*, and all persons entertaining them were called *Arminians*.—It is generally considered that the Church of England offers common ground on which the upholders of each system can unite; but, beyond the pale of the establishment, it is generally considered, that a marked diversity of sentiment concerning the comparative influence of free will and grace affords sufficient reason for the separation of the two opposing parties into two distinct communities. And hence, in the churches to be afterwards enumerated, it is a difference of opinion on these doctrines which divides the *General* from the *Particular* Baptists, the *Wesleyan* from the *Calvinistic* Methodists, and the *Sandemanians* and similar sects, which push the Calvinistic doctrines to extreme results, from all the rest.'—Pp. xlv. xlvi.

The histories of various non-conforming bodies—or as Mr. Mann sonorously terms them, 'unendowed churches'—possess considerable interest, and are given in the order of their distinctive existence. First on the list are Presbyterians, whose origin is traced to the period of the Reformation, their doctrines to Calvin, their triumph to the time of the Civil Wars, their present power to Scotland, and their decline in England to the general relapse into Unitarianism about a century ago. The Independents have much space and interest allotted to them. They are made to spring from the age of Elizabeth; their great advocate was Robert Brown, who imbued the county of Norfolk with his principles, though subsequently he himself conformed, and obtained the Rectory of Oundle. His followers, however, were more stedfast, and several of them became martyrs under the iron rule of good Queen Bess, who likewise had an Act passed at this time, giving her subjects the choice of going either to church, to prison, or perpetual banishment, return from which was death. As if to turn the scales of fortune, by a natural retribution, an Independent, in the person of Cromwell, was before long in a position to adopt the same policy, an opportunity which he did not neglect. The government of this body, as their name implies, rests on the voice of each congregation to manage its own affairs, though voluntary synods are allowed to *advise*. Only two church officers are viewed by them as authorized by scriptural authority, viz. bishops (pastors) and deacons, the former for the spiritual, and the latter for the temporal welfare of the church. They are now an important body, with accommodation in their various meeting-houses throughout England and Wales for more than a million, about half which number was present on the morning of the census Sunday, about one-fourth in the afternoon, and in the evening a number between the two.

The Baptists can hardly be described as holding certain distinctive doctrines; for they are divided into so many sects, that the name only applies with any exactness to sectarians of any kind who insist on adult in opposition to infant baptism, and on immersion. Under these circumstances, it may be easy for them

to trace a partial similarity of practice between themselves and the early British Church, though such a comparison cannot be said to have much value. The Calvinistic Baptists are the dominant party, having 1,947 meeting-houses. Other divisions are considerably less numerous; indeed, the total of them are not one-half of the Calvinistic.

The Society of Friends, Unitarians, and Moravians, we have not space to dwell on: they are not very numerous, or very proselytizing. The first date their origin from George Fox, 1646, and are now much on the decline, numbering only 371 meeting-houses; the second, whose doctrines are well known, number 229 congregations; and the third, who trace their origin from Bohemia, are an offshoot from the early Greek Church, driven to sympathise with the Protestants of Europe by the attempts of Rome to force Bohemia into conformity with the Western Church, and number but 32 chapels.

Next in chronological order come the Methodists. The importance of this great religious movement deserves a special notice. As now we see Methodism, we can institute no comparison between its present position and relations to the Church, and those which existed at its origin. It is now split up into numerous bodies, composed often of the usual elements which contribute to schism generally; but, at its first origin, we see in it a standing memorial, not so much of error in its founders, as of inefficiency on the part of the Church to satisfy the religion of its people. The following description of the Wesleys is full of interest, and cannot but enlist our sympathies on the side of warm religious feeling, against the secular, immoveable position adopted by the ecclesiastical leaders of the day, and to a certain degree enforced on them by the influence and authority of the state:—

'The great religious movement which resulted in the ultimate formation of these separate communities commenced at the beginning of the second quarter of last century. In November 1727, John and Charles Wesley, sons of the vicar of Epworth in Lincolnshire, resolving, when at Oxford University, upon a more entire devotion of themselves to a religious course of life, began to associate with a few other persons, chiefly undergraduates, similarly minded, in order to secure a more methodical employment of their time in profitable religious exercises. These consisted of meetings for prayer and serious conversation, of visits to the prisoners and the sick, of fasting, and of weekly reception of the sacrament. The strictness of their mode of life procured for them the name of "*Methodists.*" George Whitfield, then a servitor in Pembroke College, joined the association seven years after its formation.—In 1735, the two Wesleys departed for Georgia to act as the spiritual overseers of the colony just formed, and with the expectation of preaching to the Indians: they continued there about two years, and ministered with limited success and much unpleasantness.' —P. lxxi.

After his return, and when his preaching had produced the greatest excitement in many parts of England, the progress of the body is thus described:—

'Wesleyan Methodism now began to assume the appearance of an organized system. Funds were raised—meeting-houses were erected or procured in various parts of England—and the members of the society were divided into classes of twelve persons, each with its spiritual superintendent or "leader." Mr. Wesley's first design did not extend to the formation of a new religious body: his idea was to gather into small societies, for mutual religious counsel and improvement, persons under serious impressions, who might thus, if previously connected with the Church of England, be the better fitted to receive her ministrations, or, if not before connected, might by this means be prepared for her communion. Himself a clergyman, and entertaining, for some time, exalted notions of the priestly office, and of rubrical injunctions, it was only an invincible necessity that drove him to adopt, in order to diffuse among the multitude a knowledge of the Gospel, means not sanctioned by the Church. But when, because of the astonishing effects created by his preaching and by that of Whitfield, all the pulpits of the Established Church were closed against them, they were driven to pursue that system of itinerant field preaching, the prodigious influence of which has been so often and so vividly described.'—P. lxxii.

The same necessity, and the same inability on the part of the Church to do her proper work, drove him at length to the further step of ordaining persons to perform ministerial functions in America. This he did for the first time in the year 1784, being then eighty years of age. The document by which he did this is curious, and shows forth the state of the case:—

'"To all to whom these presents shall come, John Wesley, late Fellow of Lincoln College in Oxford, Presbyter of the Church of England, sendeth greeting: Whereas many of the people in the southern provinces of North America, who desire to continue under my care, and still adhere to the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England, are greatly distressed for want of ministers to administer the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, according to the usages of the same Church: And whereas there does not appear to be any other way of supplying them with ministers: Know all men, that I, John Wesley, think myself to be providentially called, at this time, to set apart some persons for the work of the ministry in America. And therefore, under the protection of Almighty God, and with a single eye to His glory, I have this day set apart, as a Superintendent, by the imposition of my hands and prayer, (being assisted by other ordained ministers,) Thomas Coke, Doctor of Civil Law, a Presbyter of the Church of England, and a man whom I judge to be well qualified for that great work: And I do hereby recommend him, to all whom it may concern, as a fit person to preside over the flock of Christ. In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and seal, this second day of September in the year of our Lord One thousand seven hundred and eighty-four. John Wesley." '—P. lxxiii.

Bishop Horne, we believe, when applied to by a clergyman as to whether John Wesley might preach in his church, replied that he was an ordained clergyman of the Church of England, and that it rested with the incumbent of each parish to admit

him or not. In this case Wesley preached with his usual power; and some clergyman who happened to be present in the congregation, unable to find any doctrinal errors in his sermon, followed him into the vestry, and questioned him as to his consistency in this matter of assuming the right to ordain. He did not defend it; but, being now old and fatigued with preaching, he said, with great emotion, 'The case was very urgent; the authorities of the Church did nothing; and, therefore, I gave them the best commission I could.'

Since John Wesley's death in 1791, many secessions have taken place from the original connexion; but the common features of them all appear to be as follows:—

'The classes were the very first of the arrangements introduced by Mr. Wesley. They consist, in general, of about twelve persons; each class having its appointed "leader," (an experienced Christian layman, nominated by the superintendent of a circuit, and appointed by a leaders' meeting,) whose duty is to meet his class once every week—converse with each class member, hear from him a statement of his spiritual condition, and give appropriate counsel. Every member of a class, except in cases of extreme poverty, is expected to contribute at least a penny per week towards the funds of the society. Out of the proceeds of this contribution, assisted by other funds, the stipends of the ministers are paid. The system of class meetings is justly considered the very life of Methodism.

'The practice of the Wesleyan Methodists is, not to preach long in any place unless they succeed in forming a "society;" so that, generally speaking, wherever they have a congregation they have also a "society," consisting sometimes of a single class, and from one to a considerable number according to the number of the members. The classes attached to each chapel or preaching place are, in the aggregate, called a "*society*." Each class has its "leader," and the meeting of all the leaders of a society is called a "leaders' meeting." Each society answers nearly to a "church" in other denominations; and as many societies as it may be found convenient to attach together form a "circuit." '—Pp. lxxiv. lxxv.

There are two descriptions of preachers, clerical, so-called, and lay; the former being appointed by the Conference, and the latter having only a local authority, being persons who follow common occupations, and receive no payment. The number of these is estimated at more than 13,000. The secret of influence among all Methodists, whether the more sober original connexion, or the ranting Primitives, seems to be in giving everybody something to do. Every one has an office, and is a party man, interested in the concerns of his chapel, and engaged in some active work that binds him to others in periodical meetings. The Church ought not to be above taking a lesson from this great spontaneous development of religious feeling. It is the tendency, indeed, of old establishment systems, for the management of everything to get into the hands of a few, a tendency which the Conference itself has experienced; for there is as much complaint now about priestly domination among Methodists as others: but

this is a symptom of decay, which must be opposed by continual efforts to impart life and interest throughout the whole body, even of our own Church. Certain functional duties are, no doubt, the simplest to perform, and the most easy to regulate, from a central department of the governing power; but it is an important question, whether, in religion, this simplicity of arrangement does really answer the higher aims for which the Church is intended? We require some means by which not only the clergy can be controlled in the proper discharge of formal services, or by which opportunities can be given for all to have within their reach the public worship of our Church, but by which, also, every individual should be quickened into something like personal interest. The class system was wisely framed for this object; and, if we cannot hope for any general scheme by which the manifold duties of religion can thus be made a bond of union among Churchmen, yet surely each clergyman in his own parish might aim, more than is usually the case, at having bands of coadjutors for all works of corporal and spiritual mercy. Church choirs, schools, visiting societies, clothing clubs, libraries, missionary associations, are all means for this end now very generally employed, but not yet with that authority and system that could be wished for. The laity need, in some places, more zeal, and in others more encouragement. It is often found more convenient to give money, or hire an inferior kind of assistance, than to raise small subscriptions, and enlist somewhat rough, and may be rebellious, helpmates. Yet such is the way really to infuse interest into the masses for the cause of religion, and to identify charitable actions with the work of the Church. It may, indeed, be found by experience, that the individual efforts of a clergyman are practically unable to control this great scheme of parochial work,—that his management is overwhelmed by contending interests,—and that he is obliged to draw into his shell before so great an army of allies, lest his authority be openly disputed, and his schemes disarranged. This is too true, except in some rare cases of a peculiar gift in the art of controlling masses,—a gift not always identical with solid theological qualifications, or the most necessary ministerial powers, and much less so with that average class of minds which must, after all, be the substratum of the clergy. It follows, then, that a central power is wanted in each of these departments, to back up the isolated clergyman's local efforts by a certain weight of authority, derived partly from the fact that it is managed by those who have special knowledge and experience in the matter, d partly from the general strength which union and system ı impart.

Methodism owes its success to a judiciously balanced system

of an active central power, regulating and using local efforts down to the extremities of its body. The Conference is a power perfectly free to decide on all the details of work; and, therefore, having real power, is not obliged to preserve its dignity by non-interference, as is too much the case with authorities of our own Church. Yet it is a power sufficiently popular in its creation to preserve esteem. We hope the time may come when an examination of the cause of their first success will be a practical question in our own Church; for we can well afford to borrow experience from others, especially from those who were, in the first instance, almost driven from among us by our own negligence, and who, in proportion as they have deserted their old more excusable position, and chosen instead of it an aspect of hostility, have fallen into divisions, and are, in fact, much shaken by the revival among ourselves which has marked the last twenty years.

It would be tedious to analyse the position of various other religious bodies enumerated; as six congregations of Glassites, who maintain that 'faith is nothing more than a simple *assent* to the divine testimony, passively received by the understanding;' or as the New Church, followers of Emanuel Swedenborg, a very dull kind of sect, which has lingered on for the greater part of a century, and now numbers about 50 congregations; or as 'the Brethren,' whose name and existence is intended as a protest against all sectarianism—although their popular appellative, 'Plymouth Brethren,' is sufficiently sectarian. On other grounds, it is unnecessary that we should here describe the tenets of the Roman Catholic Church; for, in proportion to the number of their chapels, 616, they gain for themselves, or have thrust upon them, more than an average share of notoriety. The peculiarities of 'the Catholic and Apostolic Church' will also be fresh to most of our readers, having been prominently before the public for some years, in the *person* of Mr. Henry Drummond, and in the *local centre* of the new meeting-house in Gordon-square. Their chief practical distinction from other Churches is a belief in a restoration of the fourfold ministry of the Apostles. They deny that the episcopate has absorbed the functions of the scriptural Apostolate, or that Bishops are legitimate successors of the Twelve. Much of their success may be attributed to the circumstance that they allow their adherents to conform to all sorts of Christian communions; especially they admit the provisional claims of the Anglican, Roman, and Oriental Churches. They do not claim a schismatic purpose or *status;* and as they have lately expanded in an æsthetic and ritual development, they are likely for a time to attract morbid spirits who prefer Christianity unattached to the difficulties of existing systems.

Especially are they likely to win converts among those who are intellectually incapable of adequately estimating the monstrous assumption made by the special claims of Mr. Drummond and his friends to a fresh revelation. Thirty-two chapels were returned in 1851, but their numbers have since increased considerably; and we hear that 900 communicated in Gordon Square a few Sundays back.

The last religious body which can be classed as a definite sect are the Mormonites. Their history, also, is well known. The establishment at the Salt Lake is, we understand, about to migrate to some island, in order to indulge with more freedom in the practice of polygamy. We have just seen a letter, written by a labouring man, who went out in the highest expectations of finding Nauvoo a paradise; but who was relieved by the elders of all his money before he reached the place, and told by one of them, that they would see him at a far worse place even than the Salt Lake before they gave it him back again. Their habits, according to his description, during a sort of camp journey which he commenced with them, were far from a strict adhesion to the principle of a common fund, or even of severe morals. This man felt very acutely the necessity of sleeping all night on the open deck of an American steamer, while the elders had first-rate cabins, and were dancing, fiddling, drinking whiskey, and deluding their young female converts into habits of immorality, taking no notice of himself, except to enforce secresy in his letters, and tell the people at home that they were going on 'right well.' A few such revelations must shake their position in England, though, considering the wildness of the belief required, it is wonderful how widely spread the sect has been. This is a witness, with many other things, to the ignorance of the labouring classes on religious subjects, and the little hold which the great truths of Christianity have upon them.

The Mormonites are seceders chiefly from dissenting bodies, and are partly men who have gone the round of sects, in search of religious excitement, and partly those whose motives are still of a very questionable description.

There are, besides those already mentioned, various forms of dissent, classed under the head of 'Isolated Congregations,' which again are subdivided into five kinds: First, combinations of sects, numbering more than 100 congregations. Second, congregations based upon the profession of peculiar doctrines, as 'Calvinists,' numbering, pure 81, and supralapsarian 1; 'Universalists,' 2; 'Millenarians,' 5; 'Predestinarians,' 2. Third, those religionists who refuse a name except a very general one, as, 'Christians,' 96; 'Believers,' 14; 'No particular denomination,' 7; 'Gospel Pilgrims,' 2; &c. &c.; in all, 153. Fourth, those who

while admitting some connexion with other bodies, yet seem to have forgotten, or refuse to say, with whom, numbering 43. Fifth, Missionary congregations; as those connected with the London City Mission, 7; Town Missions, 17; Seamen's Bethel, 11; in all, 39. Again, there are 78 congregations, called by Mr. Mann, 'Miscellaneous;' as 'Free Church,' 8; 'Doubtful,' 43; 'Free-thinkers,' 2; 'Southcottians,' 4, and others. The catalogue concludes with some foreign Churches, as 'Lutherans,' 6; 'Greek Church,' 3, &c.; and finally with Jews, who have 53 synagogues.

Various reflections will arise after contemplating this Babel of religion which exists among us. We dare not trust ourselves to speculation; we accept the facts and wait for the issue. A theory, however, exists in the cheering heart of Mr. Mann, which sees good in all things, and which overlooks with extensive charity all minor differences. There may indeed be good amid this evil, but we certainly have no warrant for seeing good in the very act of disunion, neither can we accept the hasty conclusions of essential agreement, which are the basis of Mr. Mann's system, as thus propounded:—

'If the preceding sketch has given any adequate idea of the faith and order of the various churches which possess in common the religious area of England, it will probably be seen to what a great extent, amidst so much ostensible confusion and diversity, essential harmony prevails. Especially is this apparent if we limit our regard to Protestant communions; which, indeed, comprise together nineteen-twentieths of our religious population. With respect to these, the differences which outwardly divide are not to be compared with the concordances which secretly, perhaps unconsciously, unite. The former, with but few exceptions, have relation almost wholly to the mere formalities of worship—not to the essential articles of faith. The fundamental doctrines of the Reformation, as embodied in the standards of the Church of England, are professed and preached by Presbyterians, Independents, Baptists, Methodists, and many minor sects, comprising more than nineteen-twentieths of the Nonconforming Protestant community; and though the different organization of these several bodies seems to present externally an aspect of disunion, probably a closer scrutiny will show that they are separated only as to matters whose importance, even if considerable, is not vital, and that thus they may, without excess of charity, be recognised as truly, though invisibly, united to the general Church of Christ. Perhaps in a people like the English—trained to the exercise of private judgment, and inured to self-reliance—absolute agreement on religious subjects never can be realized; and certainly if, at the trifling cost of a merely superficial difference, the ever various sympathies or prejudices of the people can obtain congenial resting-place, we scarcely can behold with discontent a state of things by which, at worst, external rivalry is substituted for internal disaffection; while this very rivalry itself—perhaps in part, and growingly, a generous emulation—tends to diffuse the Gospel more extensively, since thus religious zeal and agency are roused and vastly multiplied.'—P. cxvi.

The Evangelical Alliance is thus specifically referred to:—

'The basis of this association is an agreement in holding and maintaining what are generally understood to be evangelical views in regard to the

most important matters of doctrine; and its great object is "to aid in manifesting the unity which exists among the true disciples of Christ." This object is sought to be attained principally by annual conferences of members and by continual correspondence with Christian brethren in different parts of the world.'—*Ibid.*

Having thus considered the various bodies into which the religion of England is divided, Mr. Mann proceeds to test those bodies in two ways; first, as to the accommodation provided by them in their different churches and meeting-houses; and, secondly, as to the actual number of attendants on the 30th of March, 1851. We follow him in the same order.

The population of England and Wales, at the last census, amounted to 17,927,609. What accommodation would have been necessary in order to admit all to public worship who were able to come if so disposed? Various calculations have been made both as to the number per cent. able to do this at the same service, and able to be present once during the day. The scale on which Mr. Mann works his results is that, after deducting for young children, for sick and aged persons, for those in charge of houses, and persons employed on public conveyances, 58 per cent. might still attend religious worship at the same time. Applying this scale to the actual population, it follows that about seven million are kept at home at any one time, and about ten million are able to go out. Though on the system of relief, if attendance once a-day is thought a sufficient performance of religious duties, a less number than ten million seats would supply the need, even reckoning for some additional 12 per cent. above this ten million for those who can go out during some part of the day (for if the system of relief is applied to seats, it must also be applied to *sitters*), yet there are counterbalancing considerations, such as the necessity of always having a margin of room, which make it expedient to calculate on 58 per cent. or about ten million, as the proper accommodation of sittings to be provided, according to the universally recognised method of public worship adopted in England, where every one expects a seat for the whole service. Now it so happens that the number of seats required according to this calculation, very nearly corresponds with the actual number supposed to exist, the former being 10,398,013, and the latter 10,212,563. There are, however, many considerations which must be set against the immediate conclusion that there is sufficient accommodation. These places of worship are not equally distributed throughout England and Wales, so that while in some places there is a redundancy, in others there is a corresponding scarcity. And there may not only be a *local* inequality of distribution, but an inequality according to people's religious opinions. There may, for instance, be a large Quaker's meeting-house, but no Quakers; and

of course Church people do not consider that accommodation of any value which, though available if they turned Quakers, is not so on other conditions. A table is given of Registration Divisions, showing, in each one, the presumed number already accommodated, both in the gross and after deducting for unequal distribution, and the number of additional sittings required to make those, actually available, amount to 58 per cent. of the population. In this table the Welch counties alone have no occasion for fresh sittings, even after a very large deduction for unequal distribution. In London, on the contrary, after a deduction of not one per cent., there are 669,514 required, to 713,561 already provided, this being only at the rate of 29 per cent. The other divisions vary from 42 to 57 per cent., almost exactly in proportion to the modern increase of population from mining and manufactures. The total actual deficiency is thus increased, by inequality of distribution, to more than a million and a half. An even greater deficiency is probably the case, for this calculation is based on districts sufficiently large to admit of effects from the same principle within themselves, especially with regard to the Church, in which, according to the parochial system, every one is supposed to go to his own parish church. In small parishes there is generally more room than is wanted provided by the Church, and but little if any room by dissenters. From 52 instances of populations under 100, taken together to illustrate the redundancy of space in small parishes, it appears that the Church alone in these cases finds room for the whole population at the rate of 140 per cent., and dissent but 6 per cent. While, 28 instances being taken of parishes between five and ten thousand, the Church supplies only 22, and dissent 26 per cent. Within the limits therefore of a union it is more than probable that much space is lost by unequal distribution; the rural villages and *close parishes* have more than is wanted, while the central town has not sufficient. Dividing the whole of England and Wales into urban and rural parishes, the total number of sittings provided by all religious bodies, are in the former at the rate of 46, and the latter 66 per cent. If large towns only are deducted from the whole population, this disproportion increases very much, the total accommodation being only 34 per cent. in the aggregate of those above 100,000. From this Mr. Mann draws the following reflections: —

'This view suggests with singular force the mixture of sentiments which led to the erection of the greater portion of our sacred edifices. Piety and local attachments—benevolence and longing for perpetual remembrance—principally, doubtless, a sincere desire to honour God, and yet, with this, a natural desire to raise a lasting monument to themselves,—these were the mingling motives to the influence of which may be attributed the existence of some thousands of our churches. Hence, it was in the very spot

where the founder had his dwelling that his church was built: no other neighbourhood possessed such hold on his affections. Thus arose our village churches, and a multitude of structures in those ancient towns and cities where, in former times, the merchants were accustomed to reside. But our modern populous towns,—erected more for business than for residence—mere aggregates of offices and workshops and over-crowded dwellings of the subordinate agents of industry,—are inhabited by none whose means permit them to reside elsewhere. The wealthy representatives of those whose piety supplied our ancient towns with churches, fly from the unwholesome atmosphere of our new cities, and dispense their charity in those suburban or more rural parishes in which their real homes are situated and their local sympathies are centred. The innumerable multitudes who do and must reside within the compass of the enormous hives in which their toil is daily carried on, are thus the objects of but little of that lively interest with which benevolent men regard the inhabitants of their immediate neighbourhood, and which produces, in our small-sized country parishes, so many institutions for their physical and moral benefit. The masses, therefore, of our large and growing towns—connected by no sympathetic tie with those by fortune placed above them—form a world apart, a nation by themselves; divided almost as effectually from the rest as if they spoke another language or inhabited another land.'—P. cxxviii.

Everything indeed combines to prove that it is large towns which suffer from want of churches, or indeed of any places of worship. Of the 1,644,734 additional sittings estimated to be required in all England and Wales, in order to make up 58 per cent. of the population, 1,318,082 are required by 60 boroughs. Nor would it appear that the improvement which has taken place in the country at large has been shared by large towns in proportion to their needs. The churches, &c. which have been built and restored, have been more for the benefit of the middle classes who live in suburbs or in the country, than for the dense populations of large towns.

'It hence appears that the towns have by no means had a share proportionate to their need, in the liberality which, during the last half century, has added 19,387 places of worship and 5,041,440 sittings to the accommodation existing in 1801. For although the increase of provision in towns has been 174 per cent. in the 50 years, while the increase in the country parts has not exceeded 66 per cent.; yet such has been the more rapid increase of *population* in the former than in the latter (156 per cent. against 65 per cent.) that the accommodation in towns in proportion to the population is scarcely less deficient than it was in 1801—viz. 45 sittings to every 100 persons instead of 42; while the accommodation for the rest of England will still suffice for as many as 70 out of every 100 of the rural population.' —Pp. cxxxii. cxxxiii.

Places of worship may, as Mr. Mann justly observes, be near at hand and may contain many sittings, but are not available if they are not open. The practical value then of the 8,753,279 sittings computed to be within reach (after the deductions for unequal distribution), is diminished by the fact that out of the total number of sittings (before that deduction) 1,714,043 are withdrawn from use in the morning, 3,944,635 in the afternoon,

and 4,489,563 in the evening. Any calculation, therefore, based on the relief system, as making a certain number of sittings available for a larger number of attendants by means of several services, is materially altered; but this is a question more connected with the attendance than with provision for worship, as it would generally happen that paucity of services arises from lack of congregations.

Another most important consideration, with regard to the extent to which this total of more than ten million is available for public use, arises from the question, how many of these are free, and how many are confined to those who pay rent for them, or have, by their position in society, certain *powers* of absorbing space for their own use. We cannot depend on the accuracy of our information on this point, as returns were made on different modes of understanding the meaning of the word 'free;' some taking it to signify those unlet, and others all the pews of a parish for which no rents are taken. The result of the best calculation Mr. Mann can make is, that there are but just over four million available free sittings in all places of worship throughout England and Wales, and more than five million appropriated. An alarming reflection at once proceeds from this, which Mr. Mann does not specially notice, though it much strengthens his general line of argument. This five million of appropriated seats must in the nature of the case be available ones; so however are the four million free, as here calculated; but how available? Every best part of a place of worship is uniformly taken by the appropriations, leaving the remainder, even if nominally equal in number to the appropriated sittings, yet very inferior for actual use. Appropriated sittings, again, destroy any calculation that rests on a certain per centage of sittings to population, for at the same time that they withdraw more than half the number of sittings, they do not withdraw anything like the same number from the population, as being provided for by this means. How often does it happen that one person absorbs ten, or even twenty sittings all to himself! We saw a church only the other day in which one-third of the best part was occupied by three enormous pews capable of holding sixty people, all appropriated to one house, tenanted by one man, who of course never goes to church, and whose household is not large, or frequent in its attendance. Appropriated seats therefore, except in some cases of a family taking a pew, and going by turns, generally represent a less number of persons accommodated than their own numbers. Again, it is calculated that nearly two-thirds of these free seats are in the rural districts, leaving not 1,800,000 for town districts, the population of which is nine million; deduct from this population, say 3,300,000 as

accommodated by 2,300,000 appropriated sittings, and there remain six million of the poorer classes in large towns having within reach only these 1,800,000 inferior sittings of all sects and religions, even supposing they are locally available. These inequalities are swamped in the general estimate which brings the provision to be nearly equal to the requirement, but when thus brought to light they show a sad state of things in our centres of mercantile labour. And if these numbers are so inadequate on the supposition that all religious bodies have equal claim on the population of this country, how much more so if as Churchmen we desire to provide for the whole people? As a general rule, only about one-half of the accommodation provided belongs to the Church, while the other half is divided among other bodies. That which does belong to the Church is of course much more valuable for religious purposes, even apart from doctrinal or ecclesiastical considerations, inasmuch as it is far better constructed on the average, and more tied down to religious uses for perpetuity; no comparison, therefore, can stand, which includes on the one side only the churches that belong to ourselves, and on the other any hired room crammed full of benches, which may be turned into a workshop next day. In this case the Church ought to include every cottage and schoolroom which is used occasionally for some kind of religious service, whereas practically only those are returned which are acknowledged churches.

'Only 223 out of 14,077 places of worship in connexion with the Church of England were "not separate buildings;" while the number under this head out of 20,390 places of worship in connexion with dissenting churches was as many as 3,285; and probably this number is below the fact, since the published statistics issued by these various communities make mention of a greater number.'—P. cxxxvi.

Letting alone, however, the consideration of what other sects do, let us inquire how the Church is prepared to meet the presumed wants of the whole population. In order to provide the required 58 per cent., the Church wants double her present number of sittings, 'though,' Mr. Mann says, 'considering the 'hold which several other Churches, not extremely differing from 'the Church of England, have upon the affections of the people, 'few will advocate the present necessity of so extensive an 'addition.'

In the large town districts the number of sittings is only 21 per cent., whereas in the country districts it is 38; and in the former it is calculated that the number of persons able to attend worship at one time, but not provided for by any religious body, amounts to 1,200,000, while in the latter only 415,000. These numbers require, however, to be very much

increased, in consequence of the waste of room which results, as before described, from the unequal shares used by the middle classes through the system of letting and of appropriation. And supposing, even, that this increase is more needful in the country than in towns, where a better use is practically, perhaps, made of room, there yet is proof enough that, after deducting from the total population of large towns, especially London, those who are provided for by seats specially allotted for their use, and therefore not available for others, and also those who, by choice, frequent and maintain other places of worship, and whom, therefore, if they returned to the Church, we may reasonably suppose would also in their new religious condition provide means for worship, we shall find that the remainder, so peculiarly belonging to the Church, are a multitude for whom but little provision is yet made. Fill, however, these free seats —suppose, even, that by the calculations adopted by Mr. Mann, they whom they are meant for make the very most of this space, and how many will yet remain unprovided? A table is given us that will answer this question in separate districts, comparing the number of seats already provided (inclusive of those allotted) with additional sittings required in order to provide for those not accommodated by any religious body. In Shoreditch, the number under the first is, in round numbers, 9,000, and under the second 43,000; Marylebone 23,000, and 51,000; S. Pancras (where so much has been done) 32,000 and 45,000; and in S. James's, Westminster, (what a contrast in religious habits between rich and poor does this disclose!) 5,000 and 11,000. In Liverpool about 69,000 are required, nearly twice the number now existing; and in Birmingham 46,000, which is in the same proportion to the other column. The following is Mr. Mann's summary view of the general position occupied by the Church of England, arriving at the same conclusion that the above figures would suggest:—

'The general result as regards the accommodation furnished by the Church of England is, that in 14,077 buildings there are 5,317,915 sittings, equal to 29.6 per cent. of the population; that, of these, 21,673 are practically superfluous, as being out of the reach of any persons who could fill them; that the residue (5,296,242) is equal to the wants of only 29.5 per cent. of the population; and that, in consequence of a number of places not being open, there are only 4,852,645 sittings *available* for morning, 3,761,812 for afternoon, and 1,739,275 for evening service. Of the total number of 5,317,915 sittings, 1,803,773 were described as 'free;' and 2,123,395 as 'appropriated;' 1,390,747 being altogether undescribed. The inference to be drawn from the information as to the periods at which existing churches were erected, shows a rate of progress not unsatisfactory altogether, but inadequate in *towns*.'—P. cxliii.

We cannot afford much space for dissenting bodies, but the

following numbers will convey a general idea of their position. Wesleyan Methodists have 11,007 places of worship, and 2,194,298 sittings, being a provision for 12 per cent. of the population, in the proportion of 9.7 for large town districts, and 14.9 for country districts; they flourish most in the north and extreme west. The Independents have 3,244 places of worship, and 1,067,760 sittings, being a provision of 6 per cent. for the population, town districts having 4.9, and country 7.1 per cent. The Baptists are about as 2 to 3 of all these numbers. In the aggregate, the Protestant Dissenters of England provide accommodation for 26 per cent. of the population, 45 per cent. of the whole provision of the country. Roman Catholics provide 186,000 sittings, being 1 per cent. of the population; but, as we have already seen, the number of *sittings* is no guide here to congregations. Last of all come the Mormons, with accommodation for 30,000.

After a general summary of this department of *accommodation*, Mr. Mann remarks:—

'The field for future operations is distinctly marked: the *towns*, both from their present actual destitution, and from their incessant and prodigious growth, demand almost a concentration of endeavours—the combined exertions of the general Church. Without an inclination for religious worship—certainly without ability to raise religious structures—the inhabitants of crowded districts of populous cities are as differently placed as possible from their suburban neighbours, who, more prosperous in physical condition, possess not only the desire to have, but also the ability to get, an adequate provision for religious culture. New churches, therefore, spring up naturally in those new neighbourhoods in which the middle classes congregate; but, all spontaneous efforts being hopeless in the denser districts peopled by the rank and file of industry, no added churches, evidently, can be looked for there, except as the result of *missionary* labours acting from without. No agency appears more suited to accomplish such a work than that of those societies, possessed by most religious bodies, which collect into one general fund the offerings of the members of each body for church or chapel extension.'—P. cxlix.

More frequent services are also suggested both on Sundays and week-days, with the just remark that these latter are generally adapted for the middle classes rather than the poor, as they close too early to suit the hours of labour. It is also mentioned in reference to the move of the Church of England in this direction, that there is daily service in 600 churches.

Hitherto we have considered chiefly the *accommodation* provided by different religious bodies, or rather (to use the expression so frequently repeated on these pages, yet never without a passing reflection that it may, perhaps, be appropriate to speak also of other postures with respect to the service of God), the number of *sittings* which exist for the use of the people of England and Wales in public worship. We have seen that

there is, perhaps, no large deficiency in the aggregate of places and sects, but that, in particular localities, especially large towns, there is a very great want of churches, in order to provide room for that proportion of the people who might attend if they were so disposed.

But now we come to investigate the actual census of attendance, and to test the use which is already made of the opportunities which exist. If the imaginations of our readers are filled, from what has already been said of the need to provide more room, with pictures of crowded doors, and disappointed applicants for admission to the privileges of public worship, we must caution them against such hasty conclusions. The space already provided was not, on the 30th of March, 1851, by any means so amply made use of as to confirm any previous calculations of more room being needed. It appears that, 'taking the three 'services together, *less than half the accommodation actually* '*available is used.*' The total number of attendants was, in the morning, 4,647,482; in the afternoon, 3,184,135; in the evening, 3,064,449. Mr. Mann calculates that 12½ millions, or 70 per cent., might attend public worship, if disposed, at one time or other of the Sunday; and he further calculates, by supposing that one-half of the above afternoon congregations, and one-third of the evening, are to be added to the morning attendants, as representing persons not then present, that the total number of persons actually attending worship of some kind during the day was 7,261,032. A balance is therefore left of more than 5,000,000 persons *able to attend*, who neglected altogether to do so. After looking at this large number in several lights, and with regard to several bearings as to population, and as to sittings provided at different services, Mr. Mann comes to the conclusion that they were all absent purely from negligence. Again, as affording some clue to the class of people who are thus absent, he very justly remarks, that seats which are paid for are more likely to be filled than the free ones. This applies to district churches, and therefore to towns, but in the country the reverse is the case; those which are free, *i. e.* unappropriated, being generally the best filled. The total number of those who might attend during the day at one service or other has been estimated at 70 per cent. of the population, 12 more than the 58 per cent. who could at any one time. It seems, however, that the total who did attend was only about 45 per cent. in the rural, and 33 in the town districts. Yet in these latter are included a very large class who are good church-goers, and who fill seats, rented or appropriated, with considerable punctuality. The deficit, therefore, is obvious to find. It is the poor of large towns who go nowhere, though

seats are provided for them, not, indeed, equal to their needs, but far above the present use. With regard to the rural 45 per cent., it is probable that those in free seats are a considerable portion; as it is well known that seats appropriated in the country are very generally the emptiest part of a church. In town, on the contrary, the number of appropriated or rented seats will probably represent in the several services as many, or even more individuals, who are therefore to be deducted from the total attendants, before the remainder are compared with the number of free sittings. Test Birmingham on this principle. The population is 232,000; the total number of attendants at one service or other, according to the rule adopted, may be estimated at 59,000; but there are 35,000 appropriated seats, which leaves 24,000 occupants of free seats for the whole of the town in every denomination. Again, making the appropriated seats to find accommodation for, say 60,000 of the population, we have 170,000, of whom only 24,000, or about one-seventh, attended any place of worship; among whom are probably included the greater number of Sunday scholars; though all calculation dependent on them must be uncertain, as no distinctions are made between them and the rest of the congregation, and we do not even know whether the space they occupy is reckoned among the free, or appropriated sittings. If the same calculation is made in Shoreditch, and other London districts, much the same result is arrived at; whereas, in a small union in Kent, where dissent, too, is very unimportant, we find that one-half of those not having seats appropriated to them, were yet attendants at public worship.

With regard to the relative attendance on different denominations of religious worship, an interesting table is given us, from which the following facts appear:—

About 400 out of every 1,000 of the whole population attended at least once during the day; of these, 210 were those belonging to the Church of England; 44 were Independents, 33 were Baptists, 1 only was a Quaker, 2 Unitarians, about 87 were Methodists of various kinds, and 17 Roman Catholics. As a guide to the actual number of attendants in the other cases we would mention, that the Church of England had 3,773,474, the Independents 793,142, and the Roman Catholics 305,398.

The most important fact, Mr. Mann observes, which this whole inquiry brings to light, is 'the alarming number of non-attendants.' In rural districts this is not so conspicuous, especially in the southern counties; but large towns are shown to be the inaccessible abodes of heathenism. Neither church nor meeting; high and dry, broad or low; neither the Flaminia

gates, nor the bold but zealous ranter declaiming in populous thoroughfares, can fairly grapple with the great momentum of pure secularity, that, like the muddy waters of a town river, rolls on through the dense abodes of man, defiled by all that is unpleasant in our nature. All improvement that has taken place of late years has affected the middle classes far more than those lower in the scale of society.

'While the *labouring* myriads of our country have been multiplying with our multiplied material prosperity, it cannot, it is feared, be stated that a corresponding increase has occurred in the attendance of this class in our religious edifices. More especially in cities and large towns it is observable how absolutely insignificant a portion of the congregations is composed of artizans. They fill, perhaps, in youth, our National, British, and Sunday Schools, and there receive the elements of a religious education; but, no sooner do they mingle in the active world of labour, than, subjected to the constant action of opposing influences, they soon become as utter strangers to religious ordinances as the people of a heathen country. From whatever cause, in them, or in the manner of their treatment by religious bodies, it is sadly certain that this vast, intelligent, and growingly important section of our countrymen is thoroughly estranged from our religious institutions in their present aspect. Probably, indeed, the prevalence of *infidelity* has been exaggerated, if the word be taken in its popular meaning, as implying some degree of intellectual effort and decision; but, no doubt, a great extent of negative inert indifference prevails, the practical effects of which are much the same. There is a sect, originated recently, adherents to a system called "Secularism," the principal tenet being, that, as the fact of a future life is (in their view) at all events susceptible of *some* degree of doubt, while the fact and the necessities of a present life are matters of direct sensation, it is therefore prudent to attend exclusively to the concerns of that existence which is certain and immediate, not wasting energies required for present duties by a preparation for remote, and merely possible, contingencies. This is the creed which, probably, with most exactness indicates the faith which virtually, though not professedly, is entertained by the masses of our working population; by the skilled and unskilled labourer alike—by hosts of minor shopkeepers and Sunday traders—and by miserable denizens of courts and crowded alleys. They are *unconscious Secularists*, engrossed by the demands, the trials, or the pleasures of the passing hour, and ignorant or careless of a future. These are never or but seldom seen in our religious congregations; and the melancholy fact is thus impressed upon our notice, that the classes which are most in need of the restraints and consolations of religion are the classes which are most without them.'—P. clviii.

This gives but too true a picture, for numbers and figures only deceive the eye, if we gather from them any estimate of attendance, which, on the supposition of equal distribution through all classes and ages, may, indeed, sound low, but still be something. The fact is, that those who do go to church, go with tolerable punctuality, are taken from certain classes and certain ages of life, *i. e.* from the upper and middle classes, from servants, from a small portion of the old and infirm, and in

large numbers from children; other classes and ages do not attend.

The example may spread, and the influence of the wealthier classes may gradually extend; but, as Mr. Mann observes, there are reasons even in the fact that the rich do go, which prevent the poor of large towns from wishing to do so. They do not desire to mingle with them, and had rather abstain from an act which brings to their notice some mark of inferiority. So deeply rooted, indeed, are feelings of this kind, and so rapidly increasing are they from the progress of education, that to suppose we can bring journeymen mechanics, &c. to sit on a bench outside a rich man's pew-door, is a fallacy which had better be at once ignored by all church-builders who satisfy their conscience with any such arrangement of free seats. We do not say that any arrangement will immediately bring him, but that one will certainly keep him away. Indifference on the part of the rich to the social condition of the poor, is also thought to be a barrier against the influence of religion,—and, of course, it always will be; but, at the same time, there may be erroneous conceptions, on the part of the poor, as to what is possible to be done on their behalf, either by charity, or by any fancied rearrangement of political rights, as well as real indifference to their just responsibilities on the part of others. The prejudices, again, which are said to exist in disparagement of the motives which induce Christian ministers to advocate the cause of their churches, have a real foundation in the worldliness of many clerics, and the abuse of Church property; but, also, they may be an assumed and false covering, to hide simple unbelief in the abstract necessity of their mission.

Another reason brought forward why so many are forgetful of religious obligations, is the crowded and filthy state which poverty compels them to live in. There is no solitude to encourage religious reflection, or to escape the moral contamination of those around. A good word, or good intention, is soon forgotten in the urgent calls and distractions of a life that knows no quiet, or permits of no thought. In all considerations of this kind it must, however, be remembered, that there are in many localities not only *accidental*, but *substantial*, reasons for non-attendance on religious worship. Large towns, and above all London, have large classes of persons of both sexes, living in certain districts, who are from the very fact of living there immoral and vicious. These districts are absorbents of the worst refuse which is ejected from all quieter places; and they are occupied by quickly passing generations of inhabitants, with whom attendance at any place of worship could only be a mockery. No *local* reform can affect these districts, except that of ejection. So long as the

monied classes have anything which can be stolen, or have any vices or habits, the indulgence of which implies an immoral life on the part of others, so long will the ministers of robbery and of sin be found somewhere at hand. To reform these people individually, would be to deprive them of the power of living where they do; and therefore, as long as these districts are maintained in their present condition by the vices or misfortunes of the community at large, it is idle to speak of any local efforts to bring their inhabitants to public worship, or to include them in any estimate of general attendants.

Where, however, the absence from public worship is felt with the most regret, is in the multitude of hard-working men and women, whose calling is honest and regular, who show zeal, intelligence, and faithfulness in their worldly occupation and towards their employers, but who are obstinately blind to special religious duties. It is of these, probably, that Mr. Mann speaks in the following words:—

'Although by natural inclination adverse to the entertainment of religious sentiments, and fortified in this repugnance by the habits and associations of their daily life, there still remain within them that vague sense of some tremendous want, and those aspirings after some indefinite advancement, which afford to zealous preachers a firm hold upon the conscience even of the rudest multitude. Their native and acquired disinclination for religious truth is chiefly of a negative, inert description—strong enough to hinder their spontaneous seeking of the passive object of their disesteem—too feeble to present effectual resistance to the inroads of aggressive Christianity invading their own doors. In illustration, the conspicuous achievements of the patriarchs of Methodism are referred to; and a further proof is found in the success of Mormon emissaries.'—P. clxii.

But how is this aggressive system to be adopted by the Church? Districts, as at present constituted, are too large for one clergyman, with all the duties of a church on his hands, to carry on the requisite visiting from house to house which might arouse some better feeling; and, meanwhile, what is the state of things?

'The present rate of church-and-chapel-increase brings before our view the prospect, at no distant period, of a state of things in which there will be small deficiency of structures where to worship, but a lamentable lack of worshippers. There is indeed already, even in our present circumstances, too conspicuous a difference between accommodation and attendants. Many districts might be indicated where, although the provision in religious buildings would suffice for barely half of those who might attend, yet scarcely more than half of even this inadequate provision is appropriated. Teeming populations often now surround half empty churches, which would probably remain half empty even if the sittings were all free. The question then is mainly this: By what means are the multitudes thus absent to be brought into the buildings open for their use? Whatever impeding influence may be exerted by the prevalence of class distinctions, the constraints of poverty, or misconceptions of the character and motives of the ministers of religion, it is evident that absence from religious worship is attributable *mainly* to a

genuine repugnance to religion itself. And, while this lasts, it is obvious that the stream of Christian liberality, now flowing in the channel of church-building, must produce comparatively small results. New churches and new chapels will arise, and services and sermons will be held and preached within them; but the masses of the population, careless or opposed, will not frequent them. It is not, perhaps, sufficiently remembered that the process by which men in general are to be brought to practical acceptance of Christianity is necessarily *aggressive*.'—P. clxi.

'The Church of England,' Mr. Mann truly observes, 'is at 'present considerably restricted in its efforts this way by cano-'nical and customary regulations.' This is an important concession, which ought to be pushed to some practical conclusion, *i.e.* to measures of relief which may produce increased usefulness. The question, however, still remains, how this is to be done? It is easy to make suggestions, but it is fruitless to do so till some greater facility than at present exists for carrying them out is obtained. The extreme severity and length of our services is not attractive, on the one day of rest enjoyed by an artisan or labourer. Our services must either be very dull, or very long. Without music it is the former, and with it, it is the latter. Lay agents are recommended; but the Church, in sending out her messengers to collect the lost sheep, must also have regard to the folds into which she would collect them, that the pastoral charge of feeding the flock thus collected be performed so as not to weary the sheep, or present the performance of their religious duties in an unattractive form. Those agents of some kind or other are undoubtedly wanted. Buildings naturally and quickly rise with the demand for their use; and, meanwhile, the need is for a 'number of efficient, earnest, reli-'gious *teachers*, clerical or lay, by whose persuasions the reluctant 'population might be won.' The expediency of an increase in the episcopate is also mentioned, and a table given to show the enormous populations at present under the charge of a single bishop. The Bishop of London has even now more than two millions in his diocese, and, on the next avoidance of the see of Winchester, will have half-a-million more.

A review of the means by which this mass of heathenism is to be overcome, is far too large a subject to add to the mere evidence of its existence which we have now laid before our readers. Moreover, it would be only repeating many things which have already been said in these pages, while engaged on practical subjects connected with the Church's work. One thing is evident, that the Census tells no flattering tale to those large bodies of dissent which have, for the last half century, set themselves up with such bold defiance against the Church. They have ght us a lesson, in the mere fact of their existence, and also ome of their popular details of management; but, now tha.

the Church has aroused herself, there are already signs of diminished influence,—and we shall look forward with interest to the census of 1861, when a comparison can be made with their present state, which now is impossible for want of former evidence. Dissent has shown itself a schismatic power, by always thriving best, not in places destitute of all religion, but where it could best oppose the Church. From this it would appear that its function is that of a scourge upon the Church, which can take no solid or independent rooting of its own vitality, but which is rather of the nature of a diseased excrescence, or a parasite, supported by the unhealthy condition of that to which it is attached. Yet to find fault with the exertions of dissent, or to triumph over its failure, in the great scenes of irreligion now opened out before us, is but an ungracious work, when so little can yet be boasted of our own success, or of any good practical machinery yet set in motion by the Church for the conversion of English towns. Every one has his theory. One trusts to preaching in or out of doors, another to visiting from house to house, another to æsthetics in public worship; one to lectures for the mind, another to food for the body in profuse works of charity; one prefers lay agency, another minor orders; one would build churches, and another schools. There are those who insinuate, that our great ecclesiastical institutions must be uprooted as the first step; while there are others who, with more reason, and also with more love, would convert those institutions into a real bequest of the Church to her children of all classes and ages, for practical purposes of religion. A hundred panaceas might be named, in the choice or use of which the Church must consider, on the one hand, the folly and danger of rejecting useful expedients on the dry grounds of preserving the stateliness of her secular position, and, on the other, the necessity of caution not to throw away useful instruments and powers at the cry of those enemies, who would excite her to entire trust in what they call spiritual weapons, in order but to despoil her. She must have the harmlessness of the dove, but the wisdom of the serpent.

One word on lay agency, from which Mr. Mann seems to hope much. If lay agents are preferred because of any popular jealous feeling towards the clergy, we must at once protest against a principle so entirely subversive of the clerical office,—such a confession of its unfitness to do its most peculiar work. If the clergy are not now proper persons to visit with most success, the sooner they become so the better. Lay agents, again, with any formal appointment, would on a large scale become an utterly unmanageable body, if supposed to be something between the clergy and people, and less under episcopal

control, not only in their functions, but in their persons, than the latter. A distinction of a very definite kind must be maintained between clerics and non-clerics, or, in these days, the popular estimation of the value of the former will at once be given up. Let there be minor preparatory orders; let there be religious houses under ecclesiastical rule, containing as rough material as is thought expedient to win the hearts of the working classes;—let these instruments of conversion be taken as much as possible from those classes, but let not the Church have a band of formally but not ecclesiastically appointed lay agents. The Church has one mode of appointing persons to spiritual and ministerial functions, and let her use that one way, and no other. If she wants to set persons apart for this work, let them receive the imposition of hands for a post however humble; and let not any one associate the regular spiritual mission of the Church by imposition of hands, with any other conditions than the spiritual needs of her children. An ecclesiastic to *do* the Church and preaching work, with laymen systematically to *do* the visiting, would cut off all sympathy between priest and people, and wholly invalidate the functions of the Church in popular esteem.

But have laymen no function, or can they not help by personal exertion? So far from this, we think that maintaining the severe distinction between clerics and non-clerics is the only way in which to secure the most useful kind of lay assistance. Let lay men and women be encouraged by every inducement to go amongst their poorer neighbours, to read, to expound, to talk or exhort, and even to preach in rooms; but let them do this as laymen; let them be men occupied in the same daily labours as those to whom they preach; or let them be those of superior education, who, exercising the freedom of the subject, on their own responsibility and out of love of religion, give time and thought to the work. But let us not have a multitude of half-parsons, for whose mistakes the Church will be made accountable, whose burdens she will have to bear, and yet over whose actions and characters she has not that control which is acquired by the solemn vows of separation implied in even minor orders. A class of this kind would, we feel sure, be discouraging to the voluntary exertions of actual and *working* laymen, and we do not feel any confidence that they would not be promoters of schism.

But, whether with reference to lay agency, or any other scheme, we think that the study of a Government Religious Census ought to be accompanied with a prudent caution, that religion, after all, never has, or will spread, by the mere erection of a machinery applicable to the supposed wants of a people.

It begins, not from a well-planned *system*, but from a centre of some few individuals who are distinguished by earnestness and sincerity, and who spread their views by moral example, and *personal* influence. An army of preachers may fail, where, perhaps, one quiet working man might gain a victory; as a hundred sportsmen turned loose on to a marsh can do but little, compared with one or two decoy ducks, who draw by persuasion rather than by force and compulsion. Surely, in the worst parts of London some decoys might be found, who could do more as the first step in creating some feeling of love for the Church, than even an overwhelming force of an organized system which would drive all to go to some place of worship at so much per cent. of the population. Let religion assume the aspect of a personal privilege as well as a national obligation; let personal interest and energies be enlisted. Let all the details, either of service in church, or of parochial schools and institutions, be of a kind to employ the various talents and capacities which can be tempted in each neighbourhood, to join so good a cause; and, in short, let everything be done to give a feeling of usefulness and honest self-importance to as considerable a number of a district as possible.

We might well go on conceiving pictures of particular means adopted, followed by triumphant success, but we must not be too sanguine, for deeper reasons probably lie at the bottom than we can fathom, and which not even free seats, frequent attractive services, or local visiting, or any other remedy of our scheming, will remove. It may be that the age of faithlessness has arrived, fostered, to begin with, by the Church's inertness, both in doctrine and practical matters, but assuming now a bold and independent face. It may be that the duty of public worship (so long made the privilege, the luxury, the exclusive mark of the rich and *respectable*), will be openly questioned; that it will be asked what mysterious benefit do a vast number of our teachers *actually* and *practically* connect with public worship? Abstract from this duty the obligation of Sacraments in the wider sense of that word; remove what some might call the superstition that fine churches and choirs and priestly powers can do any good; and trace the consequences. A man who justly estimates the transitory effect of continual preaching, will find nothing left but what he may do at home; nor will the Bible, as he may have heard it interpreted, much stimulate him. He, or his class, have been taught, probably, that the ceremonial of the old Law is abolished; that the daily sacrifice applies in no definite way to ourselves; and on reference to the New Testament for light on the subject, he finds that but very little is said of public worship which may not be con-

strued much according to the will of the reader, if, that is, the universal practice of the Church is allowed to throw no light on it.

At present, this duty is somewhat respected, taking the country at large,—and may it continue to be so!—but our church-goers are not proselytizers, nor, in too many cases, could they give any very satisfactory reason why they go themselves, if we may judge how little the primary ideas of prayer, praise, and sacraments, enter into their consideration. They who *sit* boxed up in a *pew* through solemn acts of public humiliation and prayer as our Litany; who *read*, or hear read, in a spiritless way, the Psalms of the day once a-week, and call it praise; who never kneel before the altar, and sleep through an hebdomadal sermon; persons whose conceptions of public worship are confined to this, are not doing much to spread their outward example, or to convince an unbelieving multitude that much good can result from this much paraded duty of going to church. Under the pretext that he can *read* at home, he will *stay* at home. Yet things may be different; and, meanwhile, are we preparing to receive new swarms of active-minded, intelligent, reasonable men, in the prime of life, who shall at length be brought to God's house? Are we acquiring that freedom of action to suit the necessities of such an occasion, without which we could not retain them one day? Are we so arranging the details of worship that these new multitudes shall not be wearied by length and dulness of the service imposed on them,—not offended by invidious distinctions,—not insulted in their taste, and their preconceived notion of the dignity of the Church, by a miserable, and often ridiculous poverty of ritual? and, finally, not driven away from all sympathy with the place, by the total inability of some poor, solitary, helpless, and overburdened district Incumbent to provide any manner of discourse that is worthy of their intellects,—that can grapple with their struggling sensations, or enlist their hearts in the cause? These questions we leave to be answered by all whom they concern, or who read this Census—from Lord Palmerston, to whom it is inscribed, to all authorities in Church and State, and to all subordinate members of that national system which we still call a pure and Apostolic branch of the Holy Catholic Church.

ART. V.—1. *The Correspondence of Thomas Gray and William Mason. With Notes and Illustrations, by the Rev.* JOHN MITFORD. London: Bentley. 1853.
2. *Gray's Poetical Works and Life. Edited by the Rev.* J. MITFORD. Eton: Williams. 1852.

THERE never was a day perhaps when poets and the world at large were more at odds on the great question of the poet's work and 'mission,' than in our own. Never was the poet's aim set so high, it being nothing short of regenerating the world and changing the whole face of things; never was the world so indifferent to all the poet says and sings for its benefit. The remedy cannot get a trial; it is denied the first requisite of every recipe; it is never taken into the world's system at all. In a word, all the poems composed under such circumstances of excited and turbid inspiration, for its reformation or reconstruction, are not even read. For while the number of readers in the world has indefinitely increased,—multiplied beyond all example—the actual, not proportionate, number of readers of poetry is on the wane, and poetry has confessedly less hold on the public mind than it ever had.

We are not going to enter into the reasons of this fact, nor to probe the question of where the greater share of the fault lies. We hold it to be some sign that these lofty pretensions are either not acknowledged, or not judged to be borne out in the performance, that there is a decided revulsion in favour of our old, less ambitious writers; and that while would-be epics and 'life-dramas' are unread by any but the critics, the strains of Gray, Collins, Goldsmith, and Cowper, are reviving their influence. The costly and beautiful edition of Gray's poems lying before us suggests and may justify these thoughts; in which the publisher, by aid of the thickest paper, and fair large type, and broad margins, and copious notes, and frequent illustrations, and introductory memoirs, and commendatory verses, contrives to swell a few stanzas into a good sized octavo volume, and we doubt not finds his advantage in the venture.

The tone of present poetry, noisy, harsh, and pretentious, has perhaps naturally the effect of making us recur with tenderness to our older poets. Its obscurity, vagueness, and hard construction, are in such contrast to their finished style, that it may well turn us back in a more teachable spirit to strains almost too familiar for us, without such a lesson,

to take in their beauty with any sense of freshness. Few readers of any kind but have learnt in their time most of the poetry of Gray, learnt it perhaps before they could appreciate its beauty, which is not of a character to attract children; and which makes very little impression on the less thoughtful of them, while yet the flow of its numbers fixes it indelibly on the memory,—if not the very words, yet the measure to which they run. Just as there are strains of music, texts of Scripture, quotations from Shakspeare, which, taking hold of our memory before the understanding can entertain them, have been lying all our life undigested in the brain without the fruit of any proper comprehension, so may the poems of such writers as Gray and Collins, who for the pure and blameless character and moral tone of their verse, have been especially selected for youth, sleep with as little profit in the mature mind, which has never been led to rectify the heedlessness of childhood, or to meditate upon the stores which the teachers of its youth had been careful to provide for it. Such may not be a common case, but if it should have happened to any one that he has never repeated to himself Gray's Elegy with any thought or reflection, we should say, no time could be fixed upon better for that exquisite strain to assert its true mastery over the heart, and for dispelling the unintelligent familiarity with mere drowsy sounds which we have described, than after the perusal, that is, the laborious decyphering, of some of our much commended modern poets,—not popular,—but yet extolled in various organs of opinion. After a few hours spent on the works of Mr. Browning or Mr. Alexander Smith, or the latest novelty, 'Balder,' where the loftiest poetry professes to be held in solution, then, if ever, is he in a state to acknowledge the merits of poetry ready made to his hand, where all the *labour* of thinking has been undertaken by the poet; whose duty is to make his toil our pleasure and delight, not to demand a sort of partnership of effort; and to feel too what wide reaches of thought, what depths and glimpses into the mysteries of our being, may be opened out by a master of the art, in lines whose clear expression and melodious flow make philosophic contemplation for the time easy and natural, to all who give themselves up to their influence. Not that in calling Gray a *master* we would include him in the highest class of poets, but he is a master who succeeds in the field he has chosen for his efforts, a success all must grant in an eminent degree to Gray; and in works of genius, success, not ambitious aims, must be the criterion of merit and desert.

But it is not of Gray as a poet, or rather it is not of his poetry, that it is our first object to speak. No man ever won it so small an expense of work produced as he, and this

scantiness of matter must have stood in the way of attaining the tribute more than it has done, but that in his case an unusual amount of material remains to enable us to identify the man with his work, and that of a kind calculated to sustain the interest at first excited, and keep it gently alive. The one virtue for which Gray was preeminent was friendship, and, shy, reserved, and solitary as were his nature and his course, this virtue must chiefly exhale through his pen; and thus there remains a large and intimate correspondence to which hitherto every fifty years has added something new, all showing us the thoughts and feelings and pursuits of unquestionably *the* poet of his own time; and pleasantly proving to all lovers of his verse,—and thus justifying their high appreciation of them,—how thoroughly his muse was part of himself, no assumed or transient inspiration, but the efflorescence of his whole mind and being: every line dictated by the truest and most genuine feeling, and the most exact knowledge of the subject touched upon.

These letters, and the affectionate records of his friends, show us a man not independent of the prejudices, nor guiltless of the shortcomings of his day, yet in some essentials above and in advance of them. True, honest, conscientious, moderate, sagacious; by temperament philosophical, and by study profoundly learned,—all these qualities may belong to any age; his essentially poetical ones were in advance of his own; a romantic fancy, a taste for simplicity, a correct purity of diction, an intense love of nature, and constant observation of her beauties and phenomena, a self-reliance in estimating the importance and worth of pursuits and pleasures, to which the intellectual world of his day were indifferent,—these are the qualities which make us value his poetry now, and made Dr. Johnson undervalue him and it then. We yield to no one in admiration of Dr. Johnson in his own sphere, but in his poetic criticisms of many an author, and more especially of our present one, we find ourselves constantly needing the admonition of Blackwood's witty editor in its palmy days, on some of his perpetrations on this head: 'You will 'almost be disposed to think the Doctor a dolt—which Heaven 'forbid—for he was "*the* sage."' Johnson had a marvellously wide range of knowledge, sympathies, and interests; and wherever these extend, he is an authority; but where they do fall short, no man can be a worse guide; for his acknowledged superiority in so many things gave him confidence in pronouncing on all, and led him to assume even with arrogance the right of judging on points where a man more ordinarily circumstanced would have known himself in no situation to form a right decision. For example, we see now clearly enough that his was not a poetical temperament. He wrote, it is true, stately enough

verses, but *we* know and feel, whatever he and his friends might suppose, that they are not poetry: while he was so perpetually in the wrong in his estimate of other men's genius, so much under the influence of his own day both in his praises and his censures, that though we must always feel interest and amusement in his criticisms, no one can regard him as an authority; and we must infer from such frequent and signal mistakes, both a natural inaptitude from want of ear, and an ignorance of the principles of the art, and of the true canons of criticism. Yet he does not scruple to set down Gray, (and with him the whole brotherhood of poets since verse was written—or why should the Muse have been invoked for so many thousands of years,—) for saying simply enough, and most truly, as we believe, that the mood of composition was a rare one with him, and that it was vain to attempt verse when it was not upon him,—in such contemptuous phrases as these: 'He had a 'notion not very peculiar, that he could not write but at certain 'times or at happy moments; a fantastic foppery, to which my 'kindness for a man of learning and virtue wishes him to have 'been superior.' A judgment on the poetic faculty so insulting to the idea of inspiration and so contrary to the world's experience, that we doubt if any man but Johnson would have dared to utter it. He judged from his own experience, which was not qualified to inform him on this point. All that we can now say is, that no doubt 'Irene' or 'The Vanity of Human Wishes,' though they show great ability, might have been written equally well at any moment of their author's existence; but we must still think that such works as Gray's Elegy, or his Odes, demand a fortunate combination of circumstances to produce them, call it inspiration, a happy moment, or what you will. But Gray fared ill altogether in Johnson's hands; worse in his recorded conversation, where we have his least guarded, so, it may be supposed, most genuine opinion, than in his Life of the poet. Not only does he say, 'Sir, there are but two good stanzas in Gray's poetry;' quoting, 'For who to dumb forgetfulness a prey,' and misquoting these, and comparing his poetic graces to those of 'sixteen-string Jack;'[1] but calling him a 'dull fellow, dull in 'company, dull in his closet, dull everywhere; he was dull in 'a new way, and that made many people think him GREAT.'

[1] One anecdote of his criticisms on our poet furnishes us with a good example of his slashing style, and of the rebuffs people were liable to, however subservient, who basked in the light of his conversation:—'Talking of Gray's Odes he said, "They are forced plants raised in a hot-bed; and they are poor plants; they are but cucumbers after all." A gentleman present who had been running down Ode writing in general as a bad species of poetry, unhappily said, "Had they been literally cucumbers, they had been better things than odes."—"Yes, Sir," (said Johnson,) "for a *hog!*"'—BOSWELL.

It was this 'new way' which was in fact the offence. For Gray was not more new in his poetry than in his prose style, which is surprisingly modern and simple, compared with the elaborate sentences of that time; so that in reading his letters and the answers and notices of his friends, it is difficult sometimes to believe them of the same date. It can be for this new and refreshing simplicity alone, that Johnson characterises the letters of a pnre mind written on the most intellectual subjects with wit, acumen, feeling, and poetic powers of description, as not only 'mighty dull, but *fit for the second table.*' On this point our readers have the power of judging.

It was something new to publish private letters at all. The wits of Queen Anne's reign had indeed had their letters printed, but they had been written with this design, and, in Pope's case, under his own superintendence; they were, it was said, 'not letters, but better things.' So that when Mason, Gray's enthusiastic friend and his executor, determined upon this course, he had to introduce it with an apology, which is superfluous enough to a generation like ours, in which each individual is so willing to be on intimate and confidential terms with the public; but was no doubt then well timed.

'I am well aware that I am here going to do a thing which the cautious and courtly Dr. Sprat (were he now alive) would highly censure. He had, it seems, a large collection of his friend Mr. Cowley's letters; "a way of writing in which he peculiarly excelled, as in these he always expressed the native tenderness and innocent gaiety of his heart. Yet the Doctor was of opinion that nothing of this nature should be published, and that the letters that pass between particular friends (if they are written as they ought to be) can scarce ever be fit to see the light." What! not when they express the native tenderness and innocent gaiety of a heart like Mr. Cowley's? No, by no means; "for in such letters the souls of men appear undressed; and in that negligent habit they may be fit to be seen by one or two in a chamber, but not to go abroad in the street." Such readers as believe it incumbent on every well-bred soul never to appear but in full dress, will think Dr. Sprat has reason on his side; but I suspect that the generality will, notwithstanding, wish he had been less scrupulously delicate, and lament that the letters in question are not now extant.'—*Mason's Works of Gray*, vol. i. p. 130.

Thus Mason argues, but he could not bring himself to act up to his own convictions; and the work at the head of our article, for which we are indebted to Mr. Mitford, (who makes Gray's history his peculiar charge,) shows how, in repeated instances, he doctored and dressed up his friend's careless sentences which he thought too negligent for the public eye, and on the same system of pious fraud altered and reconstructed whole letters. Gray's style was, in fact, too modern for his intimate friend, as well as for Dr. Johnson. If he begins a letter,—

'Dear Mason,—It is but a few days since I was informed by Avison, that

the alarm you had on your sister's account served but to prepare you for a greater loss which was soon to follow;'—*Mitford*, p.16.

Mason alters the opening sentence into the following more approved form of condolence:—

'A little while before I received your melancholy letter, I had been informed by Mr. Charles Avison of one of the sad events you mention.'—*Mason*, vol. ii. p. 97.

If Gray, a young man of twenty, writes to his friend West, of the same age,—

'Cambridge, May 8, 1736.

'My dear West—My letter enjoys itself before it is opened, in imagining the confusion you will be in when you hear that a coach and six is just stopped at Christ Church gates, and desires to speak with you, &c.;'—*Mitford.*

Mason thinks it more decorous, instead of a passage of youthful rhodomontade, to substitute the following grave exordium:—

'Cambridge, May 8, 1736.

'Permit me again to write to you, though I have so long neglected my duty; and forgive my brevity when I tell you, it is occasioned wholly by the hurry I am in to get to a place where I expect to meet with no other pleasure than the sight of you.'—*Mason*, vol. i. p. 134.

If thirty years later Gray begins a letter by sending two propitiatory kisses to Dr. Wharton's little girl, who had expressed herself offended with him, and 'one a-piece to all the others;' though the whole transaction does not occupy three lines, and the letter proceeds to graver matters, Mason thinks it necessary to subjoin the following justification:—

'Some readers will think this paragraph very trifling; yet many, I hope, will take it as I give it, for a pleasing example of the amiableness of his domestic character.'—*Mason*, vol. ii. p. 218.

In fact, the beginnings of letters then were held to be important things; any informality here must be rectified at all hazards. Gray always diverted himself with these solemnities of style. 'If you will not,' he says, on one occasion, 'take 'this as an excuse, accept it at least as a well-turned period, 'which is always my principal concern,'—and an extreme specimen of the prevailing manner falling by chance in his way, he thus sends it to his friend:—

'I have just found the beginning of a letter, which somebody has dropped: I should rather call it first thoughts for the beginning of a letter, for there are many scratches and corrections. As I cannot use it myself, (having got a beginning already of my own,) I send it for your use on some great occasion:—

'"Dear Sir—After so long a silence, the hope of pardon and prospect of forgiveness might seem entirely extinct, or at least very remote, was I not truly sensible of your goodness and candour, which is the only asylum that my negligence can fly to, since every apology would prove insufficient to counterbalance it, or alleviate my fault. How, then, shall my deficiency esume, &c. &c. &c."'—*Ibid.* p. 252.

At another time he apologises to Mason for not sending him particulars of his travels, 'because I have not yet gathered up 'my quotations from the classics to intersperse, like Mr. Addison; 'but I hope soon to be able to entertain you with a dish of very 'choice erudition.'

Another modernism of our poet was a certain pride of independence, affected often now because it is the fashion, but which was certainly not one of the affectations of his own day. For the son of a money-scrivener and a milliner in Cornhill, whose mother and aunt afterwards kept an independent shop of their own, to accept of no friendship unless on absolutely equal terms, and to discard Horace Walpole for, it is supposed, some breach of the delicacy of that relation; and when courted back, to explain, with rigid punctiliousness, that his return was not to be to the old familiarity; is but one instance of this temper. Reserved, and perhaps proud by nature, he seems to have early formed his views on such points; and his philosophic moderation and wise economy enabled him to adhere to principles which many another man has held in theory, but has been forced to abandon in practice. He is perpetually indulging in little hits at his friend Mason for professing to write for money. He sets down the practice of publishing by subscription as an expedient a gentleman could not submit to. With but a small income of his own, he refuses the Laureateship, and expresses himself to his friends on the subject in such terms as these. We quote from Mr. Mitford, for Mason's caution, of course, withheld such an estimate of 'a good thing' from his contemporaries:—

'Dec. 19, 1757.

'Dear Mason,—Though I very well know the bland, emollient, saponaceous qualities both of sack and silver, yet if any great man would say to me, "I will make you rat-catcher to his Majesty, with a salary of 300*l.* a-year, and two butts of the best Malaga; and though it has been usual to catch a mouse or two for form's sake, in public, once a-year, yet to you, Sir, we shall not stand upon these things;"—I cannot say I should jump at it; nay, if they would drop the very name of the office, and call me Sinecure to the King's Majesty, I should still feel a little awkward, and think everybody I saw smelt a rat about me. But I do not pretend to blame anyone else that has not the same sensations: for my part, I would rather be sergeant-trumpeter or pin-maker to the palace. Nevertheless I interest myself a little in the history of it; and rather wish somebody may accept it that will retrieve the credit of the thing, if it be retrievable, or ever had any credit.'—*Mitford*, p. 112.

On one instance only he departed from this course, if it can be called a departure, to have asked for the Professorship of Modern Languages at Cambridge, for which he was very well fitted. To this step, he writes, he was 'cockered and spirited by his friends:' and that it was a considerable effort is apparen

'I received my answer very soon, which was what you may 'easily imagine, but joined with great professions of his (Lord 'Bute's) desire to serve me on future occasions, and many more 'fine words that I pass over, not out of modesty, but for another 'reason.' 'You see,' he goes on, 'we have made a peace. 'I shall be silent about it, because if I say anything antiminis-'terial, you will tell me you know the reason; and if I approve 'it, you will think I have my expectations still.' Not long after, on the death of the successful candidate, the Professorship was given to him, without solicitation, by the Duke of Grafton. On that occasion he had to kiss hands at the levee, his only experience of the Court; when the king said some gracious things to him, which he does not report; 'first, because every-'body that goes to court does;' and next, because 'the day was 'so hot, and the ceremony so embarrassing to me, that I hardly 'know what he said.' Such scenes were certainly very little to his taste. Though the connexion is but a fanciful one, we are here tempted to show that there were congenial pageants and levees where our poet's powers of description did not fail him. Here is a P.S. to a letter to his intimate friend Mr. Nicholls:—

'P. S. I must not close my letter without giving you one principal event of my history, which was, that (in the course of my late tour) I set out one morning before five o'clock, the moon shining through a dark and misty autumnal air, and got to the sea-coast time enough to be at the sun's levee. I saw the clouds and dark vapours open gradually to right and left, rolling over one another in great smoky wreaths, and the tide (as it flowed gently in upon the sands) first whitening, then slightly tinged with gold and blue; and, all at once, a little line of insufferable brightness, that (before I can write these five words) was grown to half an orb, and now to a whole one, too glorious to be distinctly seen. It is very odd, it makes no figure on paper; yet I shall remember it as long as the sun, or, at least, as long as I endure. I wonder whether anybody ever saw it before. I hardly believe it.'—*Mason*, vol. ii. p. 295.

Has the reader (if it is new to him) paused, as he ought, over this beautiful passage? If so, we would ask him if he knows any man—if he believes the man exists in our time, who could raise so distinct and glorious a picture, and would be content to seal it up in a letter and send it off to a friend, never to see or hear of it again; and that friend not the literary world—not the sympathising public, but only a congenial intimate, with the simple desire to please and interest him? Here we must give up our fellowship with Gray as a modern. His ideas of friendship were of the antique order. We, *i. e.* such as are capable of generous emotions, are much too busy now-a-days in reforming and sympathising with, and doing good to everybody, to afford the extravagance of friendship, which we seem to think absorbs upon one 'what was meant for mankind.' And, in fact,

a genuine friendship does take up a good deal of a man's time; we see it does in the instance before us. There are endless small demands and tender amenities to be attended to: it does not do to forget your friend's existence for days and weeks together; the bond must be kept up by ceaseless good offices; and, for all this, something like leisure is indispensable. The thirst for doing good to one's species as a whole, did not prevail in Gray's time, and least of all in himself. Men had very little notion of guiding, converting, directing the mass; the appetite for so extended a sphere of action was not awakened. Now, we fear, the tenderness of many a private relation is wounded, or deprived of its due sustenance, in the aim for each man to be influential on the largest number that can be brought within his reach. Influence is the great idol of the day; from Manchester to the smallest village, there is always to be found a struggle for this desired power. And hence it arises, that the public is now the one great friend and confidant—the general, universal ear—the great sympathetic bosom—the object for self-devotion, tenderness, expansion of heart. Its faults are allowed for, its tempers endured, its weaknesses touched with a patient hand, its demands granted at any amount of personal sacrifice. But an individual friend cannot hope for such indulgence. What but transient moments and chance thoughts can fall to his share from a mind so largely and sublimely engrossed? Thus shyness grows up between intimates, by nature formed for each other's comfort and benefit; men are ashamed to express to one another the secret inmost thoughts which they find themselves quite easily divulging in print, or at the stretch of their voices to a mixed multitude; and the art of intimacy between man and man seems in some danger of being lost. Very different—quite the contrary of all this—was it in Gray's times, if we take him as their exponent. He let the world take its course, satirising its faults, but taking no pains to amend them; but he gave himself *trouble* for his friends. He counselled, admonished, spoke the truth to them; sympathised, condoled, rejoiced with them. Their interests were his, his heart was theirs. Shy, silent, reserved, often harsh-judging to all beyond his own circle; dwelling on the faults of individuals or the community with a hard saturnine severity,—to his friends he was indulgent, tender, affectionate, open-hearted, diffuse, and allowing himself to express all this in the simple language of affection, too manly and genuine to be otherwise than pleasing now, but yet a tone which we have got out of the habit of using.

The first and most poetical example of this, is the friendship of his boyhood and youth with Richard West, grandson of Bishop Burnet. They were at Eton together, 'where Mr.

West's genius was thought the more brilliant of the two.' They learnt, read, and thought together; and to both, poetry was the chief interest and charm of literature. Gray went to Peter-house, Cambridge; West to Christ Church, Oxford; and there began a correspondence which lasted eight years, till the death of West, at a time when his great promise and brilliant talents had already marked him out for distinction. Nothing can be more engaging than the intercourse here disclosed between these (to adopt the language of the time) ingenuous youths, of whom one of their schoolfellows has written, 'that both were alike faultless in respect to morals and behaviour.' Full of zeal and ardour in their pursuits, devoted to learning for its own sake, conscious of each other's worth and powers, and holding each other always in their thoughts, they wrote, criticised, jested, moralized, confided to each other their first efforts, (of a very marked excellence,) talked to one another in odes, rivalled one another in Latin verse and Latin prose;—and over all is thrown a sadness, from the indications both show, at this early age, of that melancholy, which in West was the effect of disease, and in Gray was constitutional;—all feeling, thought, affection—expressed with a simplicity that recals the Golden age.

'My dear West,' writes Gray, on first arriving at College, 'I more than ever regret you: it would be the greatest of 'pleasures to me to know what you do, what you read, how you 'spend your time, &c., and to tell you what I do not do, not 'read, and how I do not,' &c. In his travels the most delightful scenes raise up the image of his friend. In the sublimest alpine scenery, he writes: 'If I do not mistake, I saw you every now 'and then at a distance among the trees; you seemed to call me 'from the other side of the precipice, but the noise of the 'river below was so great that I really could not distinguish 'what you said; it seemed to have a cadence, like verse.' At Tivoli, the Duke of Modena and Dame Nature think it for their glory that he should write to Mr. West a full description of the Ducal palace, ('to wit, a great room; item, 'another great room; item, a bigger room; item, another 'room; item, a vast room; item, a sixth of the same; a 'seventh ditto; an eighth, as before; a ninth, as above said; 'a tenth (see No. 1); item, ten more such, besides twenty 'beside,' &c.;) and of Nature's show of mountains, and rivers, and torrents, that stand about it, described in fine contrast to the monotony of palatial grandeur. At Rome, his fancy again summons his friend to his side: 'I am now at home, 'and going to the window to tell you it is the most beau-'tiful of Italian nights. There is the moon—there are stars for

'you! Do not you hear the fountain? Do you not smell the 'orange-flowers?' From Florence, 'which has everything in it that can bless the eyes,' he spares time to write, in answer to an anxious letter, pages of excellent and thoughtful advice in favour of West's adhering to the profession he had chosen, showing an ambition for his friend which he never harboured for himself. In a subsequent letter assuring him how little such considerations could affect their friendship:—

'As to what you call my serious letter; be assured that your future state is to me indifferent. Do not be angry, but hear me,—I mean with respect to myself. For whether you be at the top of fame, or entirely unknown to mankind; at the Council-table, or at Dick's coffee-house; sick and simple, or well and wise; whatever alteration mere accident works in you, (supposing it utterly impossible for it to make any change in your sincerity and honesty, since these are conditions *sine quâ non*,) I do not see any likelihood of my not being ever yours.'—*Mason*, vol. i. p. 264.

Finally, on his return homewards alone,—for his mysterious quarrel with Horace Walpole now occurred, which was never explained, except that the latter took upon himself the chief blame,—he sends his own portrait at five-and-twenty, which we extract for the double purpose of showing the nature of this intimacy, and informing the reader:—

'This I feel, that you are the principal pleasure I have to hope for in my own country. . . . As I am recommending myself to your love, methinks I ought to send you my picture (for I am no more what I was, some circumstances excepted, which I hope I need not particularize to you): you must add, then, to your former idea, two years of age, a reasonable quantity of dulness, a great deal of silence, and something that rather resembles than is, thinking; a confused notion of many strange and fine things that have swum before my eyes for some time; a want of love for general society, indeed, an inability to it. On the good side you may add, a sensibility for what others feel, and indulgence for their faults or weaknesses; a love of truth, and detestation of everything else. Then you are to deduct a little impertinence, a little laughter, a great deal of pride, and some spirits.'—*Mason*, vol. i. p. 270.

Gray returned to England, September 1741. The intercourse between the friends was renewed with all its former warmth. Literature was again their chief topic, for West's health forbade any application to his profession: his disorder was consumption, of which he died, as it seemed, unexpectedly to both, in May 1742, in the twenty-sixth year of his age. West's last words to him were in reproof of his melancholy: 'Vale, et vive paulisper cum vivis.' Some twenty days after this, Gray sent him his 'Ode on Spring,' which now stands at the commencement of his poems; for,—perhaps, owing to his Eton training,—Latin verse had hitherto chiefly occupied him. The packet was returned to him unopened, the friend whose praise he most valued had not lived to read it. Our poet formed other warm friendships, but none which replaced this of his

youth. Such was his tenderness towards West's memory, that through his whole life his name was never mentioned before him but his countenance assumed the serious expression of a recent severe loss. His sonnet on West's death is well known, being made an illustration, in one of Wordsworth's prefaces, of the comparative value of simple, and ornate language. He indulged his scholar-like grief, too, in appropriate hexameters. Years later, on some proposition by Horace Walpole of printing his and West's poems in one volume, Gray writes tenderly:—

'I should not care how unwise the ordinary run of readers might think my affection for him, provided those few that ever loved anybody, or judged of anything rightly, might from such little remains be moved to consider what he would have been; and to wish that Heaven had granted him a longer life, and a mind more at ease.'—*Mason*, vol. ii. p. 41.

Though published years later, it is supposed that the greater part of the 'Elegy' was composed this year; and the line in the Epitaph,

'He gain'd from Heaven ('twas all he wish'd) a friend,'

is a tribute of gratitude for a blessing he was, above most men, capable of estimating rightly. Under the excitement, too, of these sensations Gray wrote the same year his ode on a 'Distant View of Eton College,' and that to 'Adversity.' Some such stimulus was evidently needed to urge him to the effort of composition, for everything shows that composition *was* an effort to him.

The correspondence between Mason and Gray is, as it were, the history of a second friendship,—not so romantic as the first, nor so equal; for here Gray is the acknowledged superior, the critic, counsellor, arbiter,—but still admirable for constant years of unselfish regard and affection. Mason was a great man in his day—a man of thought, taste, and sentiment, and so far respectable in his profession, that we find Mr. Gisborne, one of the most respected fathers of the Evangelical School (to use a party name we would gladly avoid), extolling his memory in such words as these:—

'For hope was his, and faith's celestial ray:
Faith could the gloom of sever'd love assuage,
Brighten'd in manhood's golden prime the lay,
And warm'd with holy flame the song of age.'[1]

His poetry ranked in men's minds with Gray's, and was very commonly considered as good. Thus Dr. Johnson thought Akenside superior to *both* Mason and Gray; and we find Boswell indulging in a graduated scale of astonishment, which implies an equal estimate of the two; if he wondered that Johnson did not taste the works of Mason and Gray, still more he wondered that

[1] Elegy to the Memory of the Rev. William Mason, by Thomas Gisborne, M.A.

they did not taste Johnson's works. . . . . 'Tastes may differ as to the violin, the flute, the hautboy, in short, all the lesser instruments, but who can be insensible to the powerful impressions of the majestic organ?'[1] So long a period does it need to distinguish infallibly the genuine article from a clever imitation. To do them justice, these two friends were at the time equally aware of their comparative standing, though Gray thought very much better of his friend's poetry than it deserved. Showy, laboured, diffuse, no one could read Mason now. His day is as completely passed as 'Blair's Sermons,' or 'Hervey's Meditations;' but at the time his works raised him high in the general estimation, and they were justly commended for the purity of their moral tone.

With our present judgment of the comparative merits of the two authors, it is interesting to observe them as men, and in a certain sense satisfactory to find the more genuine poet also the more genuine man. Respectable as Mason was, we find in him an absence of the highest aims, a want of realizing the duties of his profession, an acknowledgment of very inferior motives. In such an intercourse, perhaps, the layman might naturally leave it to his superior to establish the standard of morals, at any rate it was not Gray's habit to take the faults of his friends in hand. He never directly attempted to inculcate a higher tone, and was often worldly in his wishes and designs for his friend, where his own proud independence, assisting a higher feeling, would have led him to quite a different course. Thus, Mason having an eye to preferment, Gray is greedy of it for him; Mason esteeming residence a seclusion from the society he most valued, Gray treats it in the same light: though there is constantly a bantering tone, which betrays a lurking preference for something better, and the irony may no doubt have had a moral purpose.

But there are causes which may account for a low standard of clerical duty, and consequent toleration of a certain class of faults in his friend. The clergy who came most under Gray's early observation were not a body to inspire such a mind with respect, though all his subsequent literary friendships were formed with clergymen whose grave, quiet, and decorous habits

[1] It is an amusing pendant to Boswell's estimate of Gray, to find Gray's estimate of Boswell, and to admire how curiously it tallies with the judgment of posterity, in one of his letters to Horace Walpole, 1768:—'Mr. Boswell's book I was going to recommend to you when I received your letter. It has pleased and moved me strangely, all (I mean) that relates to Paoli. He is a man born two thousand years after his name! The pamphlet proves what I have always maintained, that any fool may write a most valuable book by chance, if he will only tell us what he heard and saw with veracity. Of Mr. Boswell's truth I have not the smallest suspicion, because I am sure he could invent nothing of this kind. The true title of this part of his work is, "A Dialogue between a Green Goose and a Hero."'—*Gray's Works*, vol. i. p. 569.

suited his own. It cannot be doubted that many amongst the clergy in office at Cambridge, about the time of his residence, were a disgrace to their profession, and the faults for which they were most conspicuous were of a nature especially to disgust so fastidious, almost morbid, a temperament as Gray's. Temperate and refined in his own habits, their smoking and drinking were odious to him: passionately devoted to learning, their dulness and insensibility to all he valued were the themes of his never-tiring contempt. While he chose Cambridge for his permanent residence, he strangely enough never professed the smallest regard for the place. Very early in his acquaintance with it, he pronounced it to West 'a joy of wild asses,' 'the abode of owls and doleful creatures,' applying with but little reverence all the descriptions of Babylonian desolation to this home of academical learning, or this 'owl's nest,' as he preferred to call it. Fresh from Eton, he found them indifferent to all the classical learning he had been giving his whole youthful heart to; nor could he then apply his mind to the study of mathematics, or perceive their importance, though later in life he entirely changed his views on this point. 'It is very possible,' he says to West, 'that two and two make four, but I would not give four far-'things to demonstrate this ever so clearly. The people I behold 'around me, it seems, know all this and more, and yet I do not 'know one of them who inspires me with any ambition of being 'like him.'

Books were a necessary of life to Gray, and finding himself, on the death of his father, the possessor of a small patrimony, he chose Cambridge for his home, for the sake of its libraries, deliberately giving himself up to the pursuit of learning for its own sake, and hardly with any ulterior aim. Here he formed a few intimate friendships; and shunning general society, and making no secret of his contempt for the place, it is not to be wondered at that in spite of the credit his fame for learning brought the University, and a certain pride they took in it and in him, he was not a popular character there. After remaining in his own College, Peter-House, twenty years, we find for instance that he had to change his quarters, from the riots and insolence of some young men of fortune, whose rooms were near his own, and whose disorders the authorities, upon his remonstrance, took little pains to check. This choice of residence—for at Cambridge he lived principally for the thirty remaining years of his life—was perhaps fatal to any diffuse exercise of his poetical powers; reading was here so easy, and perhaps the tenor of his life so onotonous, that, with the exception of his two great Odes, and ie completion of what was planned before, we find little new. ertainly, habits of contempt towards such of our fellow-creatures as we must in some way fall in with,—if not in direct inter-

course, at least by neighbourhood and hearsay,—are inimical to poetry which best deserves the name; and we might not have possessed what we do, but for those long vacations spent at Stoke, in the society of his mother and aunt, where the tenderest feelings of his heart were still called forth.

The mention of Stoke and of his mother forces us to a digression. There is no indication of Gray having ever cared for any other woman but his mother. She engrossed all the regard he had to bestow on the sex, and as, whenever he felt at all he felt deeply, this affection was a part of his being. He owed, indeed, everything to her, for his father is described as a sort of monster, 'whose long indulgence in the violent passions of his 'temper seems at last to have perverted the natural feelings of 'his heart, and ended in that malignity of disposition that made 'the parent and husband the enemy of his own family.' His wife was obliged to seek the protection of the law against him; he threatened to pursue her with vengeance, and to ruin himself in order to undo her and her son—their only living child. She bore all, however, and would not abandon the shop and trade she had undertaken on her own account; and at her expense alone was her son maintained at Eton, where her brother, Mr. Antrobus, was assistant-master, and afterwards at the University. Such a mother deserved all the love a son was capable of; and he was indeed her pride and her comfort while she lived, spending some months of each year with her, and after her death clinging to her memory with his fullest tenacity of affection. He seldom mentioned her name without a sigh. He treasured her few remains, gowns and wearing apparel, in his college-rooms, having never the courage to open her boxes, in order to distribute them to her female friends. He writes years after, with a sort of bitterness, to his intimate friend Mr. Nicholls, as if, while it was in his power to prove his love, he had not done all that he ought:—

'It is long since that I heard you were gone in haste into Yorkshire, on account of your mother's illness; and the same letter informed me that she was recovered, otherwise I had then wrote to you, only to beg you would take care of her, and to inform you that I had discovered a thing very little known, which is, that in one's whole life one can never have any more than a single mother. You may think this is obvious, and (what you call) a trite observation. You are a green gosling! I was at the same age (very near) as wise as you, and yet I never discovered this (with full evidence and conviction, I mean) till it was too late. It is thirteen years ago, and seems but as yesterday, and every day I live it sinks deeper in my heart.'—*Mason*, vol. ii. p. 307.

It is a comfort to think that such a mother's last years were happy. After her husband's death she retired with her sister, they having accumulated sufficient for their modest wishes, to

the house of a third widowed sister, at Stoke, near Windsor, the churchyard of which is immortalized as the scene of the Elegy. The only evidence we can find anywhere that the son resented his father's evil doings, is in the simple epitaph he wrote on his mother, where her husband's name is not even mentioned. It is a successful example of one of the most difficult of all forms of composition. After recording the death of Mary Antrobus, her sister, 'resting in hope of a joyful resurrection,' it follows:—

'In the same pious confidence,
Beside her friend and sister,
Here sleep the remains of
DOROTHY GRAY,
Widow, the careful, tender mother
Of many children, one of whom alone
Had the misfortune to survive her.'

She, and, in a lesser degree, her sister, his aunt, 'a person he loved very much, and had been used to from his infancy,' swallowed up and engrossed all the attention he had to bestow on the gentler sex. His 'Long Story' does, to be sure, record an incident where two fine ladies sought him out, and he endeavoured to return the civility by some well-turned compliments; but such company gave him, generally, very little satisfaction; for example, we find such splenetic notices as these:—

'For me, I am come to my resting-place, (Cambridge,) and find it very necessary, after living a month in a house with three women that laughed from morning to night, and would allow nothing to the sulkiness of my disposition. Company and cards at home, parties by land and water abroad, and (what they call) *doing*] *something*, that is, racketing about from morning to night, are occupations, I find, that wear out my spirits, especially in a situation where one might sit still and be alone with pleasure; for the place was a hill like Clifden, opening to a very extensive and diversified landscape, with the Thames which is navigable running at its foot.'—*Mason*, vol. ii. p. 166.

Or this description of a fine lady:—

'I saw the lady you inquire after, when I was last in London, and a prodigious fine one she is. She had a strong suspicion of rouge on her cheeks, a cage of foreign birds and a piping bulfinch at her elbow, two little dogs on a cushion in her lap, and a cockatoo on her shoulder. They were all exceedingly glad to see me, and I them.'—*Mason*, vol. ii. p. 217.

In short, the only woman whom we find in any interesting relation to himself, besides his mother, is a certain Mrs. Bonfoy, of whose last illness there is a tender casual mention:—'Mrs. Bonfoy, who taught me to pray.' One chief privation of a college life he was, then, in no condition to feel. The absence of fine ladies might, indeed, almost atone for the presence of

boorish men, whose company he found means to avoid with very little trouble.

His acquaintance with Mason began in 1747. It arose on some early verses being shown to him, which he took the amiable trouble to revise, and afterwards he grew so much interested in their author, as to recommend him to the Fellows of Pembroke for a vacant Fellowship, at a time when this body were in a dispute with their Master about the right of nomination. This first piece of good fortune to Mason was the commencement of many others, and we trace him in this correspondence through a course of good things.

Gray's first notices of his new acquaintance are in letters to Dr. Wharton, which it needed some magnanimity in Mason to publish. The contrast of character, and Gray's conscious superiority, may be one main secret of their subsequent intimacy:—

'Mr. Mason is my acquaintance. I liked that ode much, but have found none else that did. He has much fancy, little judgment, and a good deal of modesty. I take him for a good and well-meaning creature; but then he is really in simplicity a child, and loves everybody he meets with. He reads little or nothing, writes abundance, and that with a design to make a fortune by it.'—*Ibid.* p. 48.

Again:—

The author of it (Mason) grows apace into my good graces, as I know him more. He is very ingenious, with great good-nature and simplicity; a little vain, but in so harmless and comical a way, that it does not offend one at all; a little ambitious, but withal so ignorant in the world and its ways, that this does not hurt him in one's opinion; so sincere and so undisguised, that no mind with a spark of generosity would ever think of hurting him, he lies so open to injury; but so indolent, that, if he cannot overcome this habit, all his good qualities will signify nothing at all. After all, I like him so well, I could wish you knew him.'—*Ibid.* p. 69.

The substance of many of the letters in this new volume is criticism; very excellent, frequently, on Gray's part, and valuable as containing general maxims, though, as it is in most cases lavished on Mason's poetry, and mixed with much partial though genuine praise, the reader has to exercise some discrimination. The notices, too, of Gray's own poetry are interesting, of which some specimens shall be given. But, besides the subject of poetry, we have all the topics of the day touched upon in a lively manner; for, like many a shy, reserved person, Gray had a certain love of gossip, and he cared to know *about* people for whose society he had a contempt; in fact, *news* interested him, whenever it was of a nature to exercise his powers, satirical or moral. And we find many a sly hit at the self-seeking, the neglect of duty, the manners, the lives, the deaths of Cambridge dignitaries.

'Your friend, Dr. Plumtre, (he writes) has lately sat for his picture to Wison. The motto, in large letters, (the measure of which he himself prescribed,) is, "Non magna loquimur, sed vivimus;" *i.e.* "We don't say much, but we hold good livings." '—*Mitford*, p. 195.

Here isa painful notice of the death of the Professor of Moral Theology, a Fellow and Vice-Master of Trinity, who got his nickname from having once served a curacy in the Fens:—

'Cambridge itself is fruitful enough of events to furnish out many paragraphs in my Gazette. The most important is, that Frog Walker is dead. His last words were, (as the nurses sat by him, and said, "Ah! poor gentleman, he is going!") "Going, going! where am I going? I'm sure I know no more than the man in the moon." '—*Ibid.* p. 320.

One of Gray's antipathies, was a certain Dr. Chapman, whom he called the 'conceited and overbearing Master of Magdalen College;' we find at one time the following description of him, as the triumphant orator on occasion of the Duke of Newcastle's (another of Gray's aversions) installation:—

'Thus much I may venture to tell you, because it is probable nobody else has done it, that our friend ——'s (Mason implies the name elsewhere) zeal and eloquence surpassed all powers of description. Vesuvius in an eruption is not more violent than his utterance, nor (since I am at my mountains) Pelion, with all its pine-trees in a storm of wind, more impetuous than his action; and yet the senate-house still stands, and we are all safe and well at your service. I was ready to sink for him, and scarce dared to look about me, when I was sure it was all over; but soon found I might have spared my confusion; all people joined to applaud him. Everything was quite right, and I dare swear, not three people here but think him a model of oratory: for all the Duke's little court came with a resolution to be pleased, and when the tone was once given, the University, who ever wait for the judgment of their betters, struck into it with an admirable harmony. For the rest of the performances, they were just what they usually are. Every one, while it lasted, was very gay and very busy in the morning, and very owlish and very tipsy at night: I make no exceptions, from the Chancellor to Blue Coat.'—*Mason*, vol. ii. p. 69.

And next, a history of the poor man's end. We give it in no commendation of the spirit in which it is written; but Gray's charity was not diffusive:—

'Cambridge is a delight of a place, now there is nobody in it. I do believe you would like it, if you knew what it was without inhabitants. It is they, I assure you, that get it an ill name, and spoil it. Our friend, Dr. Chapman (one of its nuisances) is not expected here again in a hurry. He is gone to his grave, with five fine mackerel (large and full of roe) in his belly: he ate them all at one dinner. But his fate was a turbot on Trinity Sunday, of which he left little for the company besides the bones. He had not been hearty all the week; but, after this sixth fish, he never held up his head more, and a violent looseness carried him off. They say he made a very good end.'—*Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 167.

Here, too, is a highly characteristic notice of a case of pro-

posed malversation of charitable funds, for which that age is so notorious:—

'In my way, I saw Winchester Cathedral again with pleasure, and supped with Dr. Balguy, who, I perceive, means to govern the Chapter. They give 200*l.* a-year to the poor of the city. His present scheme is to take away this, for it is only an encouragement to laziness. But what do they mean to do with it? That, indeed, I omitted to inquire, because I thought I knew.'—*Mitford*, p. 329.

This Dr. Balguy appears earlier in this volume in a more agreeable light; first, as having actually refused a bishopric on the ground that it had cost him one sleepless night, and he was determined it should not cost him another; and, again, where Gray says of him, soon after his appointment at Winchester, 'I do really think him very much improved since he had his 'residence there; freer and more open, and his heart less set 'upon the mammon of unrighteousness.'

This, then, being the phase of clerical character of which Gray saw most, it became, or at least he chose it for his type of whatever was selfish, or sluggish, or retrograde. When he is dissatisfied with himself, or his progress, it is the spirit of the place creeping upon him. It must be granted that the following was only too common a picture of college life:—

'The spirit of laziness (the spirit of the place) begins to possess even me, who have so long declaimed against it; yet has it not so prevailed but that I feel that discontent with myself, that ennui, that ever accompanies it in its beginnings. Time will settle my conscience; time will reconcile me to this languid companion. We shall smoke, we shall tipple, we shall doze together: we shall have our little jokes like other people, and our old stories: brandy will finish what port began: and, a month after the time, you will see in some corner of a London Evening Post, "Yesterday died the Reverend Mr. John Gray, Senior Fellow of Clare-Hall, a facetious companion, and well respected by all that knew him. His death is supposed to have been occasioned by a fit of an apoplexy, &c." '—*Mason*, vol. ii. p. 65.

Therefore, when Mason chose the clerical profession, Gray, as it were, acquiesced in a great deal, as the necessary consequence of it. And certainly he did not expect, nor did Mason give any ground for the expectation, that he should henceforth make his sacred calling the great self-denying object of his thoughts, and the work of his life. Indeed, his talk about preferment is in the highest degree unsatisfactory, though, when he got it, he made a very respectable use of it. Writing about his expectations from great people, of the chance of a living in Derbyshire or of being sent to Ireland—while he professes, in a lofty way, his indifference to which scene they 'thrust *him*,' he adds: 'Yet, 'though I say I am indifferent to both these, I will, in my pre-'sent circumstances, embrace either. The world has nothing 'to give me that I really care for; therefore, whatever she

'gives me does not matter a rush; and yet I own I would have 'something more of her too, merely because I have not philo- 'sophy—or a better thing, economy—to make what I have a 'competency.' And this was written after he had got the living of Aston, which he held till his death, in 1797.

Admissions such as these justify the tone Gray always assumes in jest; but, as his jest always has, with a good deal of earnest in it: 'Be assured,' he writes, when Mason is in eager expectation of a Canonry, 'your York Canon will never die, so the 'better the thing is in value the worse for you; . . . . it is a 'judgment that waits on your insatiable avarice.' And again, on the actual demise of the Canon:—

'It is a mercy that old men are mortal, and that dignified clergymen know how to keep their word. I heartily rejoice with you in your establishment, and with myself that I have lived to see it,—to see your insatiable mouth stopped, and your anxious periwig at rest, and slumbering in a stall.'—*Mitford*, p. 284.

And when Mason got the Precentorship, and Gray visited him while at residence at York, he still indulges in the same raillery at his friend's expense:—

'After my fortnight's residence in York, I am arrived here. The Precentor is very hopefully improved in dignity. His scarf sets the fullest about his ears; his surplice has the most air of lawn sleeves you can imagine in so short a time; he begins to complain of qualms and indigestions from repose and repletion; in short, *il tranche du Prélat*. We went twice a-day to church, with our vergers and all our pomp.'—*Mitford*, p. 291.

But let us not do Mason injustice. He made a conscientious Rector and a good Precentor. Though a King's Chaplain, he was not amongst those who incurred George the Third's reproof: 'I desire those gentlemen may be told that I come here to 'praise God, and not to hear my own praises;' a saying quoted with great satisfaction by Gray. If he did not write sermons, which might be considered in those days too great a sacrifice of time to a congregation of rustics, he employed himself in modernizing, and consequently spoiling, old homilies for the same end. He employed his great talent for music in the service of the sanctuary. He gave an organ to his village church, and formed a choir, which he took pains to instruct. He wrote an essay on English Church Music, and himself composed strains for York Minster, which are better known now than his verses. It is said that he *invented* the pianoforte, which means, we presume, that he devised some of the improvements which distinguish the modern instrument from the old harpsichord. He distinguished himself late in life by warmly advocating, in the pulpit, the abolition of the slave-trade; and his biography assures us that his life was principally devoted to the duties of his profession,

though poetry and politics (he was a strenuous and bitter Whig) were frequent relaxations. The romance of his life, as seen in this correspondence, is, however, to be found in the brief happiness of his married life, and its melancholy close. Gray was not such an old bachelor but that his friend could make him the confidant of his hopes and wishes on the first dawning of his attachment; could reckon on his sympathy in his happiness while it lasted, and turn naturally first to him for pity and consolation when fear and sorrow came. His own epitaph in Bristol Cathedral on his beloved wife—

'Take, holy earth, all that my soul holds dear!'

is, perhaps, the best known of his poems, and no doubt, though it is marked by some formalities of the age, it is the outpouring of a heart wrung with anguish. His letters convey the same impression, with more intensity. Gray had seen Mrs. Mason on their way from Yorkshire to the south, and describes her to a friend, to whom many of these letters are addressed (the Rev. James Brown): 'Mason is here, and has brought his wife '—a pretty, modest, innocent, interesting figure; looking like 'eighteen, though she is near twenty-eight. She does not speak, 'only whispers, and her cough as troublesome as ever; yet I 'have great hopes there is nothing consumptive. She is strong 'and in good spirits. We were all at the Opera together on 'Saturday last.' And soon after he writes to Mason himself with most friendly inquiries:—

'I cannot but inquire after Mrs. Mason's health. If she has 'withstood such a winter, and her cough never the worse, she 'may defy the doctors and all their works. Pray tell me how 'she is, for I interest myself for her, not merely on your 'account, but on her own. These last three mornings have been 'very vernal and mild.' Going on to speak of another friend, whom he wishes Mason to persuade to marry, 'only do not let her be a fine lady.' To which we have the following pathetic answer:—

'Cleveland Row, Feb. 2, 1767.

'Dear Mr. Gray,—No, alas! she has not withstood the severity of the weather; it has nipped her as it would have done a flower half-withered before, and she has been this last month in a most weak condition. Yet this present fine season has enabled me to get her three or four times out into the air; and it seems to have had some good effect, yet not enough to give me any substantial hopes of her recovery. There are few men in the world that can have a competent idea of what I have of late felt, and still feel; yet you are one of those few, and, I am sure, will give me a full share of your pity. Were I to advise Stonhewer to a wife, it should certainly be to a fine lady; it should not be to one he could love to the same degree that I do this gentle, this innocent creature.'—*Mitford*, p. 371.

Gray replies in a long letter, full of feeling, compassion,

and practical suggestions; making their concerns his own, and offering to come to town if his presence should be any comfort to his friend. Something more than a month later we have the following beautiful expression of sympathy, 'breathing,' as Mason expresses it, 'friendship, in its tenderest and most pathetic note:'—

'March 28, 1767.

'My dear Mason,—I break in upon you at a moment when we least of all are permitted to disturb our friends, only to say that you are daily and hourly present to my thoughts. If the worst be not yet passed, you will neglect and pardon me; but, if the last struggle be over, if the poor object of your long anxieties be no longer sensible to your kindness, or to your own sufferings, allow me (at least in idea, for what could I do were I present more than this?) to sit by you in silence, and pity from my heart, not her who is at rest, but you who lose her. May He who made us, the Master of our pleasures and of our pains, preserve and support you. Adieu! I have long understood how little you had to hope.'—*Mitford*, p. 377.

These are things to knit men's hearts together; and Gray's friendship was Mason's one earthly consolation. In the first moment of bereavement, he turned to him. This letter reached Bristol at the time of the funeral. In the short answer, Mason writes: 'I cannot express the state of my mind or health. 'I know not what either of them are; but I think that I mean 'at present to steal through London very soon, and come to 'you at Cambridge.' Two months after, the correspondence touches upon the epitaph on this much-loved wife (the three concluding lines of which, indeed, are Gray's); a composition so affecting to those who first heard it that Gray writes of his friend Dr. Wharton, (who must not be confounded with either of the brothers, Thomas or Joseph Warton,) that it had sent him brimful into another room to cry. For which tears he afterwards receives the author's benediction, "God bless Dr. Wharton, and send him (for sympathy) never to feel what I feel!" This same epitaph led to a pathetic little scene, which Mason records, between himself and Archbishop Drummond. These men did not really like one another at all, but a common sorrow had its natural effect in bringing them into tenderer feelings towards one another for the moment:—

'I dined lately,' says Mason, 'at Bishopthorpe, when the Archbishop took me into his closet, and, with many tears, begged me to write an epitaph on his daughter. In our conversation, he touched so many unison strings of my heart (for we both of us wept like children), that I could not help promising him that I would try, if possible, to oblige him. The result you have in the opposite page. If it either is or can be made a decent thing, assist me with your judgment immediately; for what I do about it, I would do quickly, and I can do nothing neither, if this will not do with correction. cannot be expected, neither would I wish it, to be equal to what I have ritten from my heart, upon my heart's heart.'—*Mitford*, p. 393.

Gray never shows the candour of true friendship more than in his criticisms. Most men would think the request to give the mind to an epitaph in which the personal interest was so remote, amongst the most irksome tasks in nature, and they would shirk it accordingly; but Gray throws himself into it at once, praises in general, but criticises sharply in detail; objecting, for instance, to the first three lines, that they might be written by the chaplain with an eye to flattering his patron. Poor Mason, sore and sorrowful, yet an author still, defends his lines; 'but 'if I thought that they implied a shadow of flattery to the 'Archbishop, I would wipe them out with a sponge dipped in 'the mud of the kennel.' We acquit him of flattery, but they were vile lines notwithstanding, and Gray did him a good turn in getting them expunged.

> 'Hence, stoic apathy, to hearts of stone!
> A Christian sage with dignity can weep.
> See mitred Drummond heave the heart-felt groan,
> Where the cold ashes of his daughter sleep.'

The epitaph, as it stands, beginning—

> 'Here sleeps what once was beauty, once was grace,'

is very well, and takes a good stand in the ranks of that not very attractive form of composition. Gray gives it his sanction with a farewell comment on the second line,

> 'Grace that with native sentiment combined,'

(suggesting 'tenderness and sense,' instead); and the seventh—

> 'Blest with each art that taste supplies, or truth,'—

'for I hate "sentiment" in verse. I will say nothing to "taste" and "truth," for, perhaps, the Archbishop may fancy they are fine things; but, to my palate, they are wormwood.'—*Mitford*, p. 405.

In another respect Gray was a valuable friend to a literary man, like Mason, in the strong stand he took against the French writers then so much in vogue. It was something, when Rousseau excited his first sensation, and when it was the fashion to rave about him, that a man of so universal an appetite for books should at once estimate him rightly. Mason has, indeed, to make some apologies for the contempt of Gray's tone towards a philosopher with whose style and tone he himself was a good deal taken—so far, at least, as to think it very fine writing. Gray had a genuine loathing of unbelief; he could regard it in no other light but that of an abhorrent contempt. Every approach to it was, as it were, a personal affront. This his constitutional low spirits account for, as they enabled him to realize what man would be without hope. Speaking of an acquaintance who harped much on the subject of materialism, he says:—

'This French author I never saw, but have read fifty in the same strain, and shall read no more. I can be wretched enough without them. They put me in mind of the Greek sophist, that got immortal honour by discoursing so feelingly on the miseries of our condition, that fifty of his audience went home and hanged themselves. Yet he lived himself (I suppose) many years after, in very good plight.'—*Mason*, vol. ii. p. 141.

And then follows the passage quoted by Dr. Johnson, in his Life of Gray:—

'You say you cannot conceive how Lord Shaftesbury came to be a philosopher in vogue. I will tell you. First, he was a Lord; secondly, he was as vain as any of his readers; thirdly, men are very prone to believe what they do not understand; fourthly, they will believe anything at all, provided they are under no obligation to believe it; fifthly, they love to take a new road, even when that road leads nowhere; sixthly, he was reckoned a fine writer, and seemed always to mean more than he said. Would you have any more reasons? An interval of about forty years has pretty well destroyed the charm. A dead Lord ranks but with Commoners. Vanity is no longer interested in the matter, for the new road is become an old one.' —*Mason*, vol. ii. p. 142.

'If the "Nouvelle Heloise" be Rousseau's,' writes Mason, 'pity me, because I live at Aston, and have not seen it; and 'be sure send me some account of it, and that with speed.' To which Gray replies:—

'I cannot pity you: *au contraire*, I wish I had been at Aston, when I was foolish enough to go through the six volumes of the "Nouvelle Heloise." All that I can say for myself is, that I was confined for three weeks by a severe cold, and had nothing better to do. There is no one event in it that might not happen any day of the week (separately taken) in any private family; yet these events are so put together, that the series of them are more absurd and more improbable than "Amadis de Gaul." The *dramatis personæ* (as the author says) are all of them good characters: I am sorry to hear it, for had they all been hanged at the end of the third volume nobody (I believe) would have cared. In short, I went on and on, in hopes of finding some wonderful *dénouement* that would set all right, and bring something like nature and interest out of absurdity and insipidity. No such thing; it grows worse and worse, and (if it be Rousseau, which is not doubted) is the strongest instance I ever saw that a very extraordinary man may entirely mistake his own talents.'—*Mitford*, p. 218.

And to Horace Walpole he writes this just criticism, at a time when it was the fashion to extol this writer to the skies:—

'Rousseau's people do not interest me. There is but one character and one style in them all; I do not know their faces asunder. I have no esteem for their persons or conduct, am not touched by their passions, and as to their story, I do not believe a word of it, not because it is improbable, but because it is absurd.'—*Gray's Works*, p. 554.

And again—

'Rousseau's Letters I am reading heavily, heavily! He justifies himself, till he convinces me that he deserved to be burnt, or, at least, his book did. I am not got through him, and you never will. Voltaire I detest, and have not seen his book.'—*Ibid.* p. 561.

To the same friend who had written to him from France, and with whom, some twenty or thirty years before, he had visited

Paris, having been even in his early youth keenly alive to the frivolity of the French character of that period, he says:—

'I was much entertained with your account of our neighbours. As an Englishman and an anti-Gallican, I rejoice at their dulness and their nastiness, though, I fear, we shall come to imitate them in both. Their atheism is a little too much, too shocking, to rejoice at. I have been long sick at it in their authors, and hated them for it. But I pity their poor innocent people of fashion: they were bad enough when they believed everything!' —*Ibid.* p. 562.

To Mason he writes:—'I have not read the Philosophical 'Dictionary. I can stay with great patience for anything that 'comes from Voltaire. They tell me it is frippery, and blas- 'phemy, and wit.' 'He once,' says Mr. Nicholls, 'made it his 'particular request to a friend of his who was going to the Con- 'tinent, that he would not pay a visit to Voltaire;' and when his friend replied, 'What can a visit from a person like me to him 'signify?' he rejoined, with peculiar earnestness, 'Sir, every '*tribute* to *such* a man signifies.' He said, prophetically, that no one could even conjecture the extent of public mischief that Voltaire would occasion; and he had a similar aversion to Hume, as a deliberate enemy of religion. Indeed, his habit of inquiring, when men of genius were first mentioned to him, 'Is he good for anything?' and his indifference to the most shining qualities, if disfigured by profligacy, or want of principle, were peculiarly honourable in a man who derived his chief pleasure from the exercise of the intellect in himself, and in the works of others.

The protest of such men in such times is of inestimable value; and English society was certainly fortunate in possessing two men of undisputed genius, who had in other respects but little in common, to lift up their voice against the irreligious spirit of the day; the one all-powerful in conversation, the other not less influential in a narrower, but yet important circle of devoted friends. That he used the power of a master mind well, we see not only on such important matters as we have just touched upon, and which, indeed, mainly concern his *own* character: we have also some very happy instances that he used this influence for the good of his friends in the duties and conduct of their daily thoughts and lives. The sensibility and tenderness of his nature, of which his friends alone were conscious, made him an excellent adviser in matters regarding the feelings and susceptibilities of others. Take the following counsels to a correspondent how to bring about a reconciliation between worthy mutual friends, once intimate, but now estranged through some misunderstanding. We ourselves attach great value to such efforts in one whose thoughts had strong currents of their own, for in most cases

minds of this order prefer to run in their own channel, and are not easily diverted to concern themselves for others in cases of mere feeling:—

'Remind him, (the person thinking himself aggrieved,) remind him eloquently, that is, from your heart, and in such expressions as that will furnish, how many idle suspicions a sensible mind, naturally disposed to melancholy, and depressed by misfortunes, is capable of entertaining, especially if it meets with but a shadow of neglect, or of contempt, from the very (perhaps the only) person in whose kindness it had taken refuge. Remind him of his former goodness, frankly and generously shown to N——; and beg him not to destroy the natural effects of it by any appearance of pique or of resentment; for that even the fancies and chimeras of a worthy heart deserve a little management and even respect. Assure him, as I believe you safely may, that a few kind words, the slightest testimony of his esteem, will brush away all N——'s suspicions and gloomy thoughts; and that, after this, there will need no constraint in his own behaviour, no, not so much as in the most trifling matter; for when one is secure of a person's *intentions*, all the rest passes for nothing.'—*Ibid.* p. 592.

Against the selfishness generally induced by a solitary life of leisure, Gray had indeed some natural safeguards; his leisure could never be wholly comfortable and easy, for he suffered both from bad health and low spirits. Though his letters contain but casual allusions to his bodily sufferings, his diary on his health, kept in Latin, is we are told a mournful record of pain and disease, of sleepless nights and feverish mornings. He suffered from constant attacks of hereditary gout, which his temperate habits could not do more than modify. He talks once, in sad enough jest, of inheriting 'all Mason's Cambridge friends, as he does all Delaval's diseases,'—and in his later years he was afflicted by such painful debilitating disorders, as to be confined mainly to his own rooms, and consequently to the society of intimate friends visiting him there. A certain delicacy of constitution belonged to him through life. Even at school he never engaged in any exercise or boyish amusement, and surveyed the sports of his schoolfellows in the beloved 'fields' he has so tenderly commemorated, from a distance. Hence he never fell into boyish ways, or school improprieties. Horace Walpole, indeed, used to say he never was a boy. He seems early to have contracted his horror of *dirt*, and he made in consequence what one of his quaint biographers calls 'an elegant little figure' at school, his dress and hair being never disordered by rude exercise. So great an aversion, indeed, had he to 'rough exercise,' that this same schoolfellow is convinced he was never on horseback in his life.

And doubtless his constitutional melancholy manifested itself his character as early. Gray never wrote a line that he did know to be strictly true; and when he wrote of himself that

'Melancholy marked him for her own,'

it was no transient mood he was recording, but a settled habit, which had been his, and must be his while he lived; though, probably, his sedentary habits did much to enhance these painful feelings, and nothing relieved them so much as travelling and change of scene. Constantly we find such notices as these:—

'Low spirits,' he writes at the age of twenty, 'are my true and faithful companions; they get up with me, and go to bed with me; make journeys and returns as I do; nay, and pay visits, and will even affect to be jocose, and force a feeble laugh with me; but most commonly we sit alone together, and are the prettiest insipid company in the world.'

'My health I cannot complain of, but as to my spirits, they are always many degrees below changeable; and I seem to myself to inspire everybody around me with *ennui* and dejection. But, some time or other, all these things must come to a conclusion.'—*Mitford*, p. 160.

'I am just settled in my new habitation in Southampton Row; and, though a solitary and dispirited creature, not unquiet, nor wholly unpleasant to myself. The Museum will be my chief amusement.'—P. 183.

'I cannot brag of my spirits, my situation, my employments, or my fertility. The days and the nights pass, and I am never the nearer to anything but that one to which we are all tending. Yet I love people who leave some traces of their journey behind them, and have strength enough to advise you to do so while you can.'—P. 152.

'Dean Swift says, one should never write to one's friends but in high health and spirits. By the way, it is the last thing people in those circumstances usually think of doing. But it is sure, if I were to wait for them, I never should write at all.'—P. 369.

'There are a few words in your letter that make me believe you wish I were in town. I know myself how little one like me is formed to support the spirits of another, or give him consolation; one that always sees things in their most gloomy aspects.'—P. 376.

Arising from this, no doubt, was his shyness, diffidence, and distrust of himself in general society, and his inability to shine there. His confessions on this score are sometimes amusing enough; as where Horace Walpole had designed to head his Works by his portrait. 'To appear in proper person at the head 'of my Works, consisting of half-a-dozen ballads in thirty pages, 'would be worse than the pillory. I do assure you, if I had 'received such a book with such a frontispiece without warning, 'I believe it would have given me the palsy:' or again, where the *embarrassment* of a public exhibition presents itself to him as the disagreeable feature of an execution. After commending the behaviour of Ratcliffe, brother of the Earl of Derwentwater, who died with so much dignity: 'One would not desire to die 'with a better grace,' he says; 'I am particularly satisfied with 'the humanity of that last embrace to all the people about 'him. Sure it must be somewhat embarrassing to die before so 'much good company.'—*Gray's Works*, p. 542.

This habitual dejection and self-distrust make Gray a remarkable contrast to most forms of the poetic temperament we are brought acquainted with; which all have their seasons of

elation and lofty self-appreciation, if these are not the habitual mood. To such Gray never makes any pretension. We know that he did think in a certain sense highly of his verse, but he never boasts of any exuberance of fancy, any uncontrollable impulses, any sublime self-confidence. His Pindaric Odes have more fire in them than are to be found now-a-days in the works of very excited minds, yet he was easily discouraged, and a few cold sentences of Mason's delayed their publication, and indeed the completion of the Bard, for a long period. In the same way the strictures of West quenched a tragedy altogether. Anything like *inflation* would be extremely repugnant to his philosophic mind, which was also fastidious of praise, patient under neglect, and indifferent to ridicule; so that though he respected the desire of fame, and considered it one of the defects of his own day that men disregarded it, his own aspirations were temperate, and under exact control. Being in the habit of self-study, and always, and under all circumstances, a lover of truth, he would be especially guarded not to exaggerate, either to himself or others, the nature or extent of his own powers. He frankly owned to the extreme effort and difficulty composition was to him: 'If I do not write much, it is because I cannot.' To Dr. Wharton, who has asked for an epitaph, he writes the apology which probably excited Dr. Johnson's ire:—'I by no 'means pretend to inspiration, but yet I affirm, that the faculty 'in question is by no means voluntary; it is the result (I suppose) 'of a certain disposition of mind, which does not depend on 'oneself, and which I have not felt this long time. You that 'are a witness how seldom this spirit has moved me in my life, 'may easily credit what I say.' And to Mason he says,—'I 'have had no more poses and muscular inflations, and am only 'troubled with this depression of mind; you will not expect, 'therefore, that I should give you any account of my Muse, 'which is at the best, you know, of so delicate a constitution, 'and has such weak nerves, as not to stir out of its chamber 'three days in a year.'

When Nicholls asked him why he did not finish his poem on the Alliance between good Government and good Education, he said he *could not;* the labour of a long poem would be hardly tolerable, and he could not endure not to finish as he went along. In fact he never allowed himself in a rapid style of composition, trusting, after the ordinary fashion to after criticism: and this sitting in judgment on his own performance as he wrote, broke the delight of composition, and he was conscious of labour. He was besides so fully impressed with the importance of in-'ıstry to happiness, the necessity of having something to do, ıat it seemed as if he renounced the fitful visits of the Muse,

who needed to be waited for and caressed, for the steadier employment of learning and study. He could not always write, but he could always read. On one occasion we find him saying: 'It is indeed for want of spirits, as you suspect, that my 'studies lie among the cathedrals and the tombs and the ruins. 'To think, though to little purpose, has been the chief amuse-'ment of my days: and when I would not, or cannot think, I 'dream. At present I feel myself able to write a Catalogue, or 'to read the Peerage book, or Miller's Gardener's Dictionary, 'and am thankful there are such employments and such authors 'in the world. Some people, who hold me cheap for this, are 'doing perhaps what is not half so well worth while.'

Constant application thus became a habit, rendering him unfit for the alternations of repose and exertion, which seem indispensable when the imagination is tasked, and which he perhaps feared for himself, lest his spirits should sink in the intervals from active employment. But there is no doubt a form of diligence which grows to be a bondage and slavery to the mind which indulges in it; and to work for the sake of work and without a suitable ulterior object, is perhaps this bondage: we are not sure that Gray was not its victim, though in the dignified and imposing form of amassing a prodigious amount of knowledge.

Yet such instances are so rare, and learning is so grand a thing, that if a man of great powers of mind chooses to devote them to the acquisition of solid, deep, and varied information—to make himself a depositary of the wisdom, and the history, and the arts of ancient and modern times, so that no field of inquiry shall be neglected by him, and the dim unknown past shall be to him an explored region, where he has set up his landmarks, and can come and go at his pleasure;—though he makes no active use of his knowledge, though he does not impart it to us, yet we cannot allow his time to have been misspent. He is a benefactor to his race: it does us good to know what men can do: he raises the standard: if he makes us more conscious of our ignorance, the consciousness of his knowledge a little elevates and refines our souls; even the wholly uncultivated profit something by the obscure vision of his acquirements, their intellects expand, their souls are lifted up out of the routine of common life, in the thought of one whose course lies altogether far away from the vulgar or transient cares which occupy them, far away in a kind of spirit-land, where other tongues are spoken and other works are done;—a land where the dead still live, and of which he holds the key and talisman whereby to converse with them.

And this was the sort of prestige which distinguished Gray. He was supposed to know everything, and was known to have

acquired all his knowledge from the most deep, legitimate sources. He abhorred a smattering of anything; he went to the fountain-head; he thought it an evil sign of the age that it produced Encyclopædias and Universal Dictionaries, as only serving to supply a fund for the vanity and affectation of general knowledge. For him even the fountain-head often failed in sufficient detail to satisfy his desires; and there are marvellous examples on record of the minuteness of his research. He was perfectly versed in the works of the Latin and Greek authors, historians, geographers, philosophers, poets; devoting six years to their perusal, digesting and examining their contents, marking their peculiarities, and noting their corrupt and difficult passages, writing these comments in margins or common-place books, with a delicacy and accuracy of penmanship little inferior to print. He formed a system of Greek chronology for his own use. The literature of Italy and France were studied with the same accuracy. History,—modern, ancient, medieval,—was his particular study; antiquities, voyages, travels, were his chosen relaxations from deeper studies. He was deeply learned in the history of English poetry, and projected a work upon it which should have included specimens of Provençal, Scandinavian, British, and Saxon poetry, with all of which he was familiar. He had more knowledge of Gothic architecture than any man of his time; indeed he may be considered to have begun the modern study of it. He was curiously learned in heraldry and genealogy. His knowledge and taste for music were remarkable. He introduced Pergolesi's music into England, and was himself a fine performer on the harpsichord, to which he sang with great taste; maintaining the poet's view, that music should be subservient to poetry. He was also a lover of less severe music, was a diligent visitor at the opera whenever he was in town, when we have frequent critical notices of the first singers. More than once, we come upon a mention of our old friends 'the musical glasses,' immortalized in the 'Vicar of Wakefield,' whose soft tones delighted Gray's ear. He calls them 'a cherubim in a box.' His knowledge of painting and sculpture was of the same order, exactly like that of a connoisseur with whom it was the main pursuit, yet with a poet's application of the knowledge: as, for instance, where we learn that Raphael's wonderful picture of the prophet Ezekiel suggested to him the grand form and aspect of his 'Bard.' He was a diligent observer of nature. He kept diaries and journals of the most exact accuracy of wind and weather, of plants and flowers, of birds, insects, fishes,—being profoundly read in all the books that treat of natural history, and adding, in their margins, the fruits of a most loving and vigilant daily personal observation. Indeed, the only studies which did not engage his attention

were theology and mathematics; the former from a want of inclination; the latter, that his respect for this science came too late for more than longings and regrets.

Having enlarged on this accuracy of knowledge, we are tempted to give some examples, and that rather upon those subjects of least general interest, as proving his independence of fashion or common opinion, and indeed trenching, as Mr. Mitford says, on the verge of rational inquiry:—

'I possess, among several others of his books, his copy of "Voyage de Bergeron;" and all through this book, which is a thick quarto volume, he has followed the author in his account of the names and succession of the Persian, Tartar, and Chinese dynasties; sometimes illustrating, sometimes enlarging his account, with the same apparent pains which he had previously taken in his classical and poetical studies. As one example of this minute and extended curiosity, Bergeron says, speaking of Bagdo, "*Second fils de Hoccato Cham, il fut noyé avec un nombre des siens.*" Gray first adds, "Bagdo was nephew to Oglai. Bergeron is wrong: the drowning took place in 1235, and Bagdo Khan was certainly alive many years after: he died in 1256." Again, Bergeron says, "*Mango Cham fut noyé;*" Gray adds in the margin, "Muncaca or Mango Khan was not drowned, but in reality slain in China, at the siege of Ho-chew, in 1256." Another traveller had said, "The name of this king was *Abassidus Admeh:*" Gray adds, "Admeh Emir ali Mumenin; this Abassid, surnamed Al-Nasor, was 52d khaliff; but he came not to the throne till A.D. 1175; so that the Khaliff then reigning must be Hassan Al Moothaday, his predecessor."'—*Gray's Poetical Works.*

The following passage shows the minuteness and accuracy of his geographical researches. It is a dissertation on the situation of a city, of whose existence (beyond perhaps a dim recollection of the name) in any part of its career, we venture to surmise, many of our readers have lived in contented ignorance. This extract from the ample page of his knowledge begins after the question of what extent of country Ptolemy included in his Parthia, and how far it was enlarged beyond its original boundaries, has already been treated at great length. Our readers may think it dry, but it is important he should remember that Gray did not, though this region had not then the interest which modern events invest it with. No study was dull to him, because he pursued each with a poet's faculty of realizing. Here he sees the country, the city, and the mountain that overshadows it, in the relief and vividness of an actual prospect, not tracing it out on the flat lifeless surface of a map. It is the same with the climate and the people.

'As it was a remarkable pass through the mountains, which divided the Persian empire (as it were) into two parts, and led out of Media Rhagiana into Parthyene, we must, in the first place, find out where the district and city of Rhaga or Rhagea lay, which (as Isidorus tells us) was the largest in all Media in his time. What Strabo calls by the name of Ῥάγεια, I take to be that particular spot of ground on which the city stood, founded by Seleucus the first, and by him called Europus, to which the Parthian kings

gave the name of Arsacia, yet more generally known by that of Rhagea. This appears to me to be the meaning of that expression of his, ἡ πρὸς Ῥαγαῖς καὶ αὕτη Ῥάγεια τὸ τοῦ Νικάτορος κτίσμα, &c.; and he says, the place was so called (Ῥαγαί, in the Greek tongue, signifying clefts or fissures) from the earthquakes that had happened there, by which many cities, and, as Posidonius relates, 2,000 villages, had been overturned. He adds that it lay south of the Portæ Caspiæ, at the distance of 500 stadia from them, and that all this part of Media was low, and sheltered by the mountains, excessively fertile, and productive of everything but the olive-tree. We are told farther, that the district of Rhagæ was eleven days' march from Ecbatana; and that the Greek cities of Heraclea, Charax and Apamea (all of them upon or near the north-eastern frontier of Media) were not very remote from the city of Rhagea. Nothing (I think) can be more evident than that Rhagæ (or Media Rhagiana) is the territory so often mentioned by the Eastern writers, under the name of Rey. It is the north-eastern part of the great province of Irak Agemi (Media Major), which is in general so rough and elevated a country, as to be called by way of distinction Al Gebal, or the mountainous region; yet it is remarked that hereabouts, from Hamadan towards Com and Rey, it opens mostly into plains: it was a very extensive district, full of villages, and celebrated for its fertility, well-watered, but excessively hot and stifling, and not healthy, the mountains keeping off the northern breezes. The city of Rey itself was about twenty-seven leagues to the south-east of Casbin; one day's journey south of Demavend, a chain of mountains (inclosing several fine valleys) which separates this part of Irak from Taberistan; to one of them (the loftiest in all Persia) the name of Demavend is particularly appropriated. It may be seen at fifty leagues distance, being usually covered with snow, and appears to hang directly over the city of Rey, though it is three leagues off. On its top is a dry and sandy plain, of a hundred acres in extent, in which are above sixty openings which breathe forth smoke and sometimes flame. The tradition of the country is, that Solomon imprisoned there a dreadful demon, which he had subdued; others say that Dahak, an ancient tyrant of the fabulous Pishdadian race, lies under it (like the Typhœus of the Greeks beneath Mount Etna), breathing fire. There are many hot springs near it, and mines of lead, vitriol, and antimony. All these are indications of a soil impregnated with sulphur, and subject to frequent earthquakes. Hushenk, another of those old monarchs, whom they believe to have reigned before the deluge, is said to have fought here with a race of giants who inhabited the Demavend, and to have been overwhelmed by a huge rock which they flung at him. This seems to be but the ancient Greek fable of the Phlegra transferred to these distant countries; and the Greeks themselves used to apply it to all places where there were eruptions of fire,—as in Campania, in Cilicia, in Sicily, in Lydia, &c. To this Hushenk the Persians attribute the foundation of Suster (Susa), which they take to be the most ancient city in the world, and of Rey; which, fabulous as it is, shows the opinion of the people concerning their great antiquity. Pliny informs us that the Medes of this country were called Pratitæ, or the οἱ παρ' ὁδόν: the reason of this latter appellation is plain; for all persons who came from the western and southern parts of the empire, (in their way to Hyrcania north, or to Aria and to the other provinces east, or from these provinces on their way to the south and west,) were obliged to fetch a compass round and pass through the territory of Rhagea, in order to avoid that vast desert, which lies between Media and Asia, Persis and Parthia. No wonder, then, if a city so advantageously seated, both for commerce and defence, maintained for many ages the figure and dignity of a capital. It was declining after the conquest of the Saracens, when Al Mahadi (the 21st Khalif) repaired its walls and

improved and enlarged it with sumptuous buildings, towards the end of the 8th century; and in the next it was looked upon as the largest city of Irak Agemi, being above a league in length, and half as much in breadth, and in multitude of inhabitants inferior to none in the whole empire, except Bagdad, the residence of the Khalifs. In 1062 it was the capital of Togrul-beg, the first sultan of the great Selgiukid dynasty; but under the Khuaresmian monarchs, into whose hands it fell next, it was reduced to a miserable condition by the factions that prevailed in it; the Sunni and the Shaï, two religious sects, tearing one another to pieces, till in 1220 the city was little better than a heap of ruins; and the Mogol Tartars, immediately after overrunning the country, totally destroyed what remained of it. Some attempts were made in succeeding times to restore it, but they came to nothing; and the city of Casbin seems to have succeeded to those advantages that Rey once enjoyed. The proofs which I have given above that Rhagea and Rey were the same cities are so convincing, it is a wonder that Golius, a man better versed in the Greek and Roman authors than most Orientalists have been, should not have seen it. He says,' &c.—*Works*, p. 245.

But we hold that our readers will be satisfied without being eye-witnesses of the defeat of Golius. It must be remembered that this pains is taken to satisfy the writer's own mind—apparently without much distinct idea of making further use of it, or allowing others to be the gainers of so much erudition. However, though we cannot treat of Gray without touching upon his learning, the work with which we are now most concerned shows Gray not in this light so much as in that of a critic, not of the dead, but of the living, the poet being his friend. Friendship called him very much to the practice of this art, and yet it was not one that he loved; indeed, he often expresses a poet's contempt for it. 'You know,' he says, 'I do not pique myself 'upon criticism, and think even a bad verse as good a thing, or 'better, than the best observation that ever was made upon it.' And in the same spirit he expresses dissatisfaction with himself after a few sharp and just sentences on Akenside:—'And so 'methinks, in a few words, I have very pertly despatched 'what perhaps may for several years have employed a very 'ingenious man, worth fifty of myself.' A reflection which it would be well for critics by profession to retain in their memories. We have said that his estimate of Mason was too high, yet all his criticisms are so just, that we clearly see partial friendship had the main hand in the mistaken general estimate, though there was also a sympathy with Mason's subjects. Where the poetry itself is forgotten, the verbal criticism upon it loses its interest, but good general maxims must always retain their original value. One principal difference between these two friends was in their modes of composition. Mason always supposed himself in a hurry of invention which admitted no pause for hesitation or reflection; he never waited for epithets, but if they did not occur at the time, left spaces for

them to be put in after—a plan which accounts for any degree of languor and insipidity. Gray was always fighting against this practice:—

'Extreme conciseness of expression, yet pure, conspicuous, and musical, is one of the grand beauties of lyric poetry; this I have always aimed at, and never could attain. The necessity of rhyming is one great obstacle to it: another, and, perhaps, a stronger is, that way you have chosen of casting down your first ideas carelessly and at large, and then clipping them here and there, and forming them at leisure; this method, after all possible pains, will leave behind it, in some places, a laxity, a diffuseness; the frame of a thought (otherwise well invented, well turned, and well placed) is often weakened by it. Do I talk nonsense, or do you understand me? I am persuaded what I say is true in my head, whatever it may be in prose,—for I do not pretend to write prose.'—*Mitford*, p. 128.

To this Mason (who had previously acknowledged the difference, and described Gray's verses as coming from him armed *cap-a-piè*, at all points, like Minerva from the head of Jupiter) replies with a submissive sort of testiness:—

'I do wish indeed that these Odes were all of them finished; and yet, by what you talk of "measure, and rhythm, and expression," I think I shall never be able to finish them—never, certainly, at all, if I am not to throw out my ideas at large; so, whether I am right or wrong, I must have my way in that; therefore talk no more about it.'—*Ibid.* p. 131.

Readers having nothing to do but with results, it matters not to them how a good verse was written, so it is a good one. Still, is not this hurry, which is, we imagine, the more common mood of composition, a sort of confession of weakness? As if the poet were conscious he had not got fairly hold of an idea, which a stronger mind once possessed of would have no fear of losing, and, therefore, would not let go till it was thoroughly and deliberately mastered. *Expression* Gray avows to be the main point—the great distinguishing characteristic of poetry with him: 'We think in words,' he says; 'poetry consists in *expression*, if that term be properly understood;' and in commending a passage, we find, 'exemplary for the expression, always the great point with me;' and pursuing the same view, he argues upon one of Mason's old British scenes:—

'Now, I insist that sense is nothing in poetry, but according to the dress she wears, and the scene she appears in. If you should lead me into a superb Gothic building, with a thousand clustered pillars, each of them half a mile high, the walls all covered with fret-work, and the windows full of red and blue saints that had neither head nor tail, and I should find the Venus de Medici, in person, perched up in a long niche over the high altar as naked as ever she was born, do you think it would raise, or damp my devotions? I say that Mador must be entirely a Briton, and that his pre-eminence amongst his companions must be shown by superior wildness, more barbaric fancy, and a more striking and deep harmony both of words and numbers.'—*Ibid.* p. 164.

Of course, there is a fallacy in this argument, though the

conclusion is perfectly just; 'tis not *only* the dress, but the ideas, *i. e.* the 'sense,' which would be outraged by the introduction he imagines. It is, perhaps, this passage, together with one written in early youth, advocating the language of Shakspeare for tragedy, rather than that of Addison, where he says—'The language of the age is never the language of poetry, except among the French, whose verse, where the thought or image 'does not support it, differs in nothing from prose. Our poetry, 'on the contrary, has a language peculiar to itself,'—which has induced Wordsworth to rank Gray at the head of those who, by their reasonings, have attempted to widen the space of separation betwixt prose and metrical composition. Gray's example, we firmly believe, tended to bring the language of poetry *nearer* to nature; but his mind was not, we think, suited for abstract reasoning; therefore we should always know the subject that prompted his arguments, and then we shall not find him mistaken. His verbal criticism is all on the side of simplicity. When he takes Mason's words and sentences piecemeal, and appends such comments on them; '*To* "*moral excellence,*" a remnant of the bad books you read at Cambridge; so is "*the dignity of man;*" "There is too much of the *Muse* here;" and again, "I do not much care for any Muse at all here;' '*Cull living garlands,*' &c.; 'Too verbose;' 'I insist that "*deigns*" (though it be a rhyme) should be "deign'st;" and "fills," "fill'st;" and "bid," "bid'st;" do not blame me, but the English tongue. I do not like "*meandering* way;" nor the word "*sprite,*"' &c. &c.;—his criticism is all on the side of common sense, though his ear is quick in detecting prosaic, unmusical, and flat expression.

In his own poetry we find no attempt to veil common thoughts in an ambitious phraseology; and noble, or deep, or meditative thoughts naturally, and of necessity, assume appropriate and, therefore, not common language. There are passages in Gray as simple as anything Wordsworth ever wrote; take that stanza in his 'Ode to Vicissitude,' where he gives us, no doubt, his own experience:—

'See the wretch who long has tost
On the thorny bed of pain,
At length repair his vigour lost,
And breathe and walk again:
The meanest floweret of the vale,
The simplest note that swells the gale,
The common sun, the air, the skies,
To him are opening paradise!

Or that sweetest of rejected stanzas, which he struck out of the Elegy, for fear, as it is said, of making too long a parenthesis, but we suspect, because he might well imagine the subject, though

dear to himself (as being the real accompaniments of a favourite and most familiar scene), too common and undignified for the taste of that day :—

> 'There scatter'd oft, the earliest of the year,
> By hands unseen, are showers of violets found;
> The red-breast loves to build and warble there,
> And little footsteps lightly print the ground.'

But without forcing points of resemblance between poets who have their different claims to our regard and affection, and though we must allow that the style and taste of one is more ornate than the other, yet we would both assert that Gray was, in his day—as Wordsworth in a later—a refiner and simplifier of our language, and that he had this in common with Wordsworth, that nothing in his poetry is the fruit of a transient or assumed feeling. With both, their poetry is a transcript of their lives; and both wrote neither more nor less than what they meant. The study of Gray's life is valuable, if but for this end, that it raises our respect for his poetry. What a comment, for instance, is his love of learning, and the variety of his pursuits, upon his Elegy! The 'ample page' of knowledge and the 'spoils of time' were ever open, and ever sought out by him. This thirst it was which made him feel so intensely, and therefore describe with such pathos, the privations of ignorance; and dwell upon that dispensation of Providence which withholds from so large a portion of the human race the full cultivation of their powers: while the humility which belongs to true learning leads him to vindicate the real equality of man in the midst of the widest external differences, reminding him and us that circumstances alone make him to differ from the most untaught. Every allusion gains a fuller meaning, when we know that no art, no pursuit, no feature of nature is touched upon, but it has engaged the full powers of his mind; and are made to observe that the felicity of an epithet, or a description, is no new idea or lucky hit, but part of himself, the bloom and flower of his daily thoughts. It may be doubted whether any description in poetry can take strong and lasting hold of the popular mind, unless it is the fruit of this observation and knowledge; perhaps it is only the maturity of a thought that can give true grace and expression to language, and that every exquisite line is so much experience. Something of this kind must be true, though it is owned that time alone distinguishes the real from the counterfeit; winnows away the slight volatile creations of the hour from these little epitomes of the poet's existence, which last for ever; and shows, too, where knowledge prompted the description, or where only a momentary effort of fancy.

Certainly we cannot at first sight see *why* it needed a *knowledge* of Gothic architecture to describe merely its most obvious beauties felicitously,—

> 'The long drawn aisle and fretted vault;'

nor a musician, to sing,—

> 'Now the rich strain of music winds along,
> Deep, majestic, smooth and strong;'

nor why it required a sympathy with the science of heraldry to define its pretensions so justly as the '*Boast* of Heraldry;' nor why a man must have mused in a churchyard for months or years to picture so accurately its surface,—

> 'Where heaves the turf in many a mouldering heap;'

nor that a man should have made natural history an ardent study before he can characterise trees, birds, and insects by leading, most easily discerned features; as where—

> 'The beetle *wheels* his *droning* flight;'—
>
> 'The swallow *twittering* from the straw-built shed;'—
>
> 'The nodding beech,
> That wreathes its old fantastic roots so high;'

that he must have meditated upon owls, feathered and human, before he could arrive at that bird's just epithet, and impress us duly with her long dominion,—

> 'The *moping* owl,'
> Her 'secret bower,' and 'ancient solitary reign;'

that he must have been a botanist from the age of fifteen, and all his life keep a floral calendar, to regret so keenly that—

> 'Full many a flower is born to blush unseen.'

The truth is, that the question of epithets (for the use of which we were all taught in our youth that Gray was distinguished) is not one of the poet's *invention*, but of his knowledge and experience; they describe the atmosphere through which he sees things, and his habitual view of them; and show how much keener are the impressions on his senses, and how far more vivid these operations on the thinking faculty, than on those of common men: and to leave them to be *supplied afterwards*, simply proves that the poet is not possessed by his theme as he ought to be, and that he does not see it in a light that differs from other men's. No one can conceive the Elegy to have been composed on this plan; on the contrary, the adjective epithets, *i. e.* the conditions of the scene, were prior in the poet's mind to the substantive details; as in the '*glimmering* landscape,' the '*solemn* stillness,' the '*lowing* herd,' the 'ploughman's *weary* way,' the '*drowsy* tinklings of the *distant* fold;'—all these circumstances of evening contrasting with the *breezy* call of the *incense-breathing*

morn that follows. And this is what Gray meant by *expression;* it is the *poet's* mode of viewing things, which all the world might see if it had the gift;—the act of seeing them suggesting the appropriate sounds by which the same impression may best be conveyed to others. There are, indeed, some impressions common to us all, that cannot be defined but by some one gifted with this power. If we attempt to put the following into harsh or mere commonplace wording, the thought is gone. It needs all the poet's skill, his mastery over rhythm and measure, to enable us to see, or rather to feel it as he does:—

> 'For who to dumb forgetfulness a prey,
> This pleasing anxious being e'er resign'd,
> Left the warm precincts of the cheerful day,
> Nor cast one longing lingering look behind?'—

gifted lines, and a masterpiece of expression, which are the fruit of many a melancholy, sorrowful hour; without which sad experience the slow dragging length and artful alliteration of that last line would never have forced us to pause and shudder on the brink of the grave, and look back with him on the cheerful day, whether we will or no. It was this one point of sympathy —a constitutional melancholy—which compelled Johnson, in spite of his prejudices, to own that this was true poetry, and to recognise the poet's gift of looking 'before and after.'

One afterthought there is in the Elegy, and that a curious one. It bears on Gray's political opinions, which were not so decidedly Whig as we might suppose from the passage as it stands. The names of Milton and Cromwell were supplied afterwards. It originally stood,—

> 'Some mute inglorious *Tully* here may rest,
> Some *Cæsar* guiltless of his country's blood.'

However some may be disposed to quarrel with the stanza as they are familiar with it, no one, we should think, can really wish these old Romans back again where they look so very much out of place.

The Elegy enjoyed an immediate popularity, which surprised its author, and speedily ran through eleven editions. It took a high stand at once, and has been a sort of chosen subject for comment and criticism ever since; for which its finish, and its fulness of meaning, make it well adapted. This very finish is a provocation to some minds. Lord Brougham, for instance, has counted the epithets, and quarrelled with the opening description of evening, because it took up more space than Dante's 'Era gia l'ora,' and the six lines which follow. If Gray's detail tired him we give him leave to complain; but nothing can be more unreasonable than to circumscribe one poet to the measure of another when the object in view in each case is so absolutely

different. This objection, belonging to a busy man, in a busy age, was not, however, heard then; people did not grudge the time for reading it and musing upon it, and they thought it touched many a chord of feeling not heard before. But Gray's popularity in his Elegy did not serve him, as it ought, in recommending his two noble Pindaric Odes which followed a few years later. Noble they certainly are, though they do not touch the heart like the other. We, who know to our cost what obscure verse is, are amused to find the outcry that was then raised against the obscurity of these poems. Their author resented this more than he seems to have valued his former praises, though nothing connected with his own compositions affected him very deeply. The composure with which he bore a parody from the pen of Coleman, seems to have surprised his contemporaries, who were liable to get themselves into great heats, and forget their dignity on such occasions. Probably his slowness to publish these poems tended to this philosophy. 'The Progress of Poesy' was written two years before it was printed, and the 'Bard' remained unfinished from 1755 to 1757, till the author was inspired by the visit to Cambridge of a blind Welsh Harper, of whom he says: 'Mr. Parry has been here, 'and scratched out such ravishing, blind harmony, such tunes 'of a thousand years old, with names enough to choke you, 'as have set all this learned body a-dancing, and inspired them 'with due reverence for Odikle' (or the little ode; this sort of nicknames to people and things was one of Gray's humours) 'whenever it shall appear. Mr. Parry, you must know, it was, 'that has put Odikle in motion again.' They were published in 1757, eight years after the 'Elegy,' and were, comparatively, coldly received. This is his answer to Mr. Hurd's acknowledgment of his copy:—

Stoke, Aug. 25, 1757.

'Dear Sir,—I do not know why you should thank me for what you had a right and title to; but attribute it to the excess of your politeness, the more so, because no one else has made me the same compliment. As your acquaintance in the University (you say) do me the honour to admire, it would be ungenerous in me not to give them notice that they are doing a very unfashionable thing; for all people of condition are agreed not to admire or even understand. One very great man writing to an acquaintance of his and mine, says that he had read them seven or eight times, and that now when he next sees me, he shall not have above thirty questions to ask. Another peer believes that the last stanza of the second ode relates to King Charles the First and Oliver Cromwell. Even my friends tell me they do not succeed, and write me many topics of consolation on that head; in short, I have heard of nobody but a player, and a Doctor of Divinity, (Garrick and Dr. Warburton,) that profess their esteem for them. Oh yes! a lady of quality, a friend of Mason's, who is a great reader; she knew there was a compliment to Dryden, but never suspected there was anything said about Shakspeare or Milton, till it was explained to her; and wishes there had been titles prefixed, to tell what they were about.'—*Mitford*, p. 95.

To Mason he writes:—

'I would not have put another note to save the souls of all the owls in London. It is extremely well as it is—nobody understands me, and I am perfectly satisfied. Even the Critical Review (Mr. Franklin I am told), that is rapt and surprised, and shudders at me, yet mistakes the Æolian lyre for the harp of Æolus, which indeed, as he observes, is a very bad instrument to dance to. If you hear anything (though it is not very likely, for I know my day is over), you will tell me. Lord Littelton and Mr. Shenstone admire me, but wish I had been a little clearer. Mr. (Palmyra) Wood owns himself disappointed in his expectations. Your enemy, Dr. Brown, says I am the best thing in the language. Mr. Fox, supposing the Bard sung his song but once over, does not wonder if Edward the First did not understand him. This last criticism is rather unhappy, for though it had been sung a hundred times under his window, it was absolutely impossible King Edward should understand him; but that is no reason for Mr. Fox, who lives about 500 years after him. It is very well; the next thing I print shall be in Welsh—that's all.'—*Ibid.* p. 99.

'Out of spite,' as he expresses it, Gray published the next edition with notes, which are certainly a curiosity in their way: the lady of quality can no longer miss Shakspeare and Milton, whose names answer at the foot of the page to the numbers affixed to the allusion to them; and the historic notices in the second Ode, 'which,' as he says, 'alluded to a few common 'facts to be found in any sixpenny History of England, by 'way of question and answer, for the use of children,' are as carefully guarded from misapprehension. He is equally careful to do justice to the writers from whom he may chance to have taken a hint, as far as he recollects, though we believe in many of these cases he did not really take a hint at all, only observed a resemblance.

The fine imitations of Norse and Welsh poetry, in the 'Descent of Odin,' the 'Fatal Sisters,' and the 'Triumphs of Owen,' show his love of the romantic school of poetry which then dawned. His antiquarian enthusiasm on such subjects and his passion for ancient ballads remind us of Walter Scott. It unfortunately made him a little credulous, and he was a resolute dupe of Ossian, at least for a time, choosing to believe in the genuineness of Macpherson's imitations against his better judgment. It is time, however, that we bring our remarks to a close, and yet we cannot do so without proving, by selecting here and there a picture from amongst his descriptions of scenery, that if his *poems* are few, it was from no lack of the poetic faculty, nor that this gift failed him as years gained upon him. He was, all his life, capable of the most intense pleasure from the impressions of sense; he had that 'organic sensibility' indispensable in his art,—the power of identifying himself with the scene, and with this the artist's gift of making others see and feel with him.

Take a scene amongst the rocks in Craven; it is for the

kind of life with which he invests the inanimate stone that we instance it:—

'I followed my guide a few paces, and the hills opened again into no large space; and then all farther way is barred by a stream that, at the height of about fifty feet, gushes from a hole in the rock, and spreading in large sheets over its broken front, dashes from steep to steep, and then rattles away in a torrent down the valley: the rock on the left rises perpendicular, with stubbed yew-trees and shrubs staring from its side, to the height of at least 300 feet; but these are not the thing: it is the rock to the right, under which you stand to see the fall, that forms the principal horror of the place. From its very base it begins to slope forwards over you in one block or solid mass, without any crevice in its surface, and overshadows half the area below with its dreadful canopy. When I stood, at, I believe, four yards distance from its foot, the drops, that perpetually distil from its brow, fell on my head; and on one part of the top more exposed to the weather, there are loose stones, that hang in air, and threaten visibly some idle spectator with instant destruction; it is safer to shelter yourself close to its bottom, and trust to the mercy of that enormous mass which nothing but an earthquake can stir. The gloomy, uncomfortable day well suited the savage aspect of the place, and made it still more formidable; I stayed, not without shuddering, a quarter of an hour; and thought my trouble richly paid, for the impression will last my life.' —*Mason*, vol. ii. p 287.

Mountain scenery always impressed him in the same overpowering way, as in the following brief notice (not description) of the Scottish mountains:—

'I am returned from Scotland, charmed with my expedition. It is of the Highlands I speak; the Lowlands are worth seeing once, but the mountains are extatic, and ought to be visited in pilgrimage once a year. None but those monstrous creatures of God know how to join so much beauty with so much horror. A fig for your poets, painters, gardeners, and clergymen, that have not been among them: their imagination can be made up of nothing but bowling-greens, flowering-shrubs, horse-ponds, Fleet-ditches, shell-grottoes, and Chinese rails. Then I had so beautiful an autumn, Italy could hardly produce a nobler scene; and this so sweetly contrasted with that perfection of nastiness, and total want of accommodation, that Scotland only can supply. Oh, you would have blessed yourself! I shall certainly go again. What a pity it is I cannot draw, nor describe, nor ride on horseback!'—*Mitford*, p. 349.

By the way, his love of the picturesque brought him into scenes but little suited to his fastidious refinement; his raptures are interspersed with such notices as these. Of Edinburgh: 'I am not sorry to have seen that most picturesque (at a dis-'tance) and nastiest (when near) of all capital cities. Here' (at Dunkeld)—and he has been describing the adjacent scenery with great enthusiasm—'here we passed the night; if I told you how, you would bless yourself.' And he unaffectedly admits, in the midst of genuine raptures, his satisfaction that the walks are clean; for 'you know I am no lover of dirt.' But glorious lakes, and tumbling torrents, and prodigious mountains, and awful heights, and rushing rivers, and terrible precipices, which

draw from him the tribute due to Scotch scenery,—'Since I saw the Alps I have seen nothing sublime till now,'—triumph over his disgusts. The poet gets the better of the man, precise old bachelor as he was.

His descriptions of these scenes to his friends, do not *aim* at poetry or power, only at simple, truthful accuracy. So that passages of higher beauty occur, as it were, by chance, and often in brief sentences; as in this evening scene among the Westmoreland Lakes:—

'In the evening I walked alone down to the lake, by the side of Crowpark, after sunset, and saw the solemn colours of night draw on, the last gleam of sunshine fading away on the hill-tops, the deep serene of the waters, and the long shadows of the mountains thrown across them, till they nearly touched the hithermost shore. At a distance was heard the murmurs of many water-falls, not audible in the day-time; I wished for the moon, but she was *dark, and to me silent,*

"Hid in her vacant interlunar cave." *Mason,* vol. ii. p. 266.

Or this pretty realizing of a giddy height,—and he seems to have been susceptible of dizziness:—

'From thence I was to walk a mile over very rough ground, a torrent rattling along on the left hand; on the cliffs above hung a few goats; one of them danced and scratched an ear with its hind foot in a place where I would not have stood stock-still

"For all beneath the moon." *Ibid.* p. 286.

Or passing notices, as—

'The craggy tops of a hundred nameless hills.'

'Monmouth lies on the same river, in a vale that is the delight of my eyes, and the very seat of pleasure.'

'Saddleback, whose furrowed sides were gilt by the noonday sun, whilst its brow appeared of a sad purple from the shadow of the clouds as they sailed slowly by it.'

We often come upon a rich picturesque cluster of epithets, characteristic of his poetic style; as this description of Derwentwater:—

'Opposite are the thick woods of Lord Egremont and Newland Valley, with green and smiling fields embosomed in the dark cliffs; to the left the jaws of Borrowdale, with that turbulent chaos of mountain behind mountain rolled in confusion; beneath you, and stretching far away to the right, the shining purity of the lake reflecting rocks, woods, fields, and inverted tops of hills, just ruffled by the breeze, enough to show it is alive, with the little buildings of Keswick, Crosthwaite Church, and Skiddaw for a background at a distance. Behind you, the magnificent heights of Walla crag.'—*Mason,* vol. ii. p. 261.

Nor was his fancy idle in appropriately peopling such scenes. How well, for instance, his 'old abbot' becomes Nettley Abbey, and adds peace to a peaceful picture:—

'In the bosom of the woods (concealed from profane eyes) he hid the ruins of Nettley Abbey; there may be richer and greater houses of religion,

but the abbot is content with his situation. See there, at the top of that hanging meadow, under the shade of those old trees that bend into a half circle about it, he is walking slowly (good man!) and bidding his beads for the souls of his benefactors, interred in that venerable pile that lies beneath him. Beyond it (the meadow still descending) nods a thicket of oaks, that mask the building and have excluded a view too garish and luxuriant for a holy eye; only on either hand they leave an opening to the blue glittering sea. Did you observe how, as that white sail shot by and was lost, he turned and crossed himself to drive the tempter from him who threw that distraction in his way?'—*Ibid.* p. 294.

Nothing in Gray was wholly fancy; even this chastened mood in his 'Abbot' has its counterpart in his own personal feelings. Though on such a subject these transpire too seldom, yet there is a consolatory genuineness when we do meet with them which satisfies us that his mind was ready and apt at religious meditation, and that his philosophy was that of a Christian: as where we find him thus musing on the benefits of sorrow and bereavement:—

'He who best knows our nature (for He made us what we are), by such afflictions recals us from our wandering thoughts and idle merriment; from the insolence of youth and prosperity, to serious reflection, to our duty and to Himself; nor need we hasten to get rid of these impressions; time (by appointment of the same Power) will cure the smart, and in some hearts soon blot out all the traces of sorrow: but such as preserve them longest (for it is partly left in our own power) do perhaps but acquiesce in the will of the chastiser.'—*Ibid.* p. 246.

Such passages as these let us into the inner mind; but this is indeed peculiarly the effect of Gray's letters, and of all we are told about him: they show us the man. And he who in his own days was known intimately but to few, who even in his immediate neighbourhood was an object of curiosity to those whom only a few walls separated from him, who, from his reserved and recluse habits, was so rare a spectacle, that we are told, when he did appear in the College walks, or other public places, intelligence ran from college to college, and the tables, if it chanced to be dinner-time, were thinned by the desertion of the young men who thronged to behold him; while if he passed on some occasion of ceremony through the quadrangle of their college, every man would take off his cap out of respect to the rare visitant,—becomes, before we have ended our studies, intimately known to us; his 'frailties' and his 'merits' all open, his characteristics known to us, his habits and mode of life familiar. And a very remarkable exception to his class we find him, and yet as true a poet as any, the greatest amongst them; for in his lamp burned the sacred fire, though he cherished it after a fashion of his own. In the abundance of his learning he had studied deepest and with most love what he himself calls the 'favourite and celestial

science' of Poetry; he was, in fact, that rarest of all, a philosophic poet. Not a poet who wrote philosophically; but whose philosophic temperament moulded his whole being as well as his verse; checking, subduing, moderating, holding under even the fire of genius, that no line or thought, though inspired by the Muse herself, should pass but through a severe scrutiny. Nothing hasty, rash, intemperate, could exist in that region; nor could worldly motives of vanity, or fashion, or gain. This least impetuous of poets was also the most disinterested. He despised the thought of money as an aim; nor did he, whose fortune was but small, and his means for the greater part of his life limited, ever gain, or seek to gain, a farthing by his writings. His wise and generous economy was untinctured by the slightest stain of avarice.

Not that we would disparage money as a motive for exertion. Even in the highest walk of genius it is a natural and respectable one; nor do we know an instance of any voluminous author acting without its stimulus. But the absence of this motive in the case before us has, nevertheless, its value in strengthening the claim we have put forward of deep feeling and truth. There is a common enough fallacy with respect to verse, that where *art* is used, the poem is artificial. Gray was indeed an accomplished artist; all the skill that Nature and knowledge and practice put within his reach, he sedulously employed to make his verse as perfect, as faultless, as sweet, as musical, as expressive as might be; but truth was throughout his end and aim—vivid, impressive, distinct truth. Seeing more distinctly, feeling more keenly than other men, he said nothing he did not mean, and he spared no pains to say that well. And this truth it is that makes his verse live; that keeps it ever fresh and young; that makes his language as much the language of to-day as it was of a hundred years back. How few poets,—though many there are of greater name than his, and it may be of more fertile, teeming imagination,—have left behind them, as he has, so many scenes and subjects indissolubly connected with his images and pictures of them! The evening time, the twilight hour, rustic labours and village life, the circumstances of pomp and state, poetry, history, and art, fame, friendship, remembrance, the yearnings of our common nature, the shudderings on the verge of the grave—these themes will always be associated with the words of power which once defined them; and while our country retains its characteristics, and our language its purity, the stanzas in which our poet has enshrined his musings can never become obsolete or forgotten.

ART. VI.—1. *Lectures on Social Science, and the Organization of Labour.* *By* JAMES HOLE. 8vo. London: Chapman. 1851.

2. *The First Report of the Society for Promoting Working Men's Associations. To which is added, a Report of the Cooperative Conference held in London, at the Society's Hall,* 34, *Castle Street East, on the* 26*th and* 27*th of July,* 1852. London: Lumley. 1852.

3. *Report of the Cooperative Conference, held at Manchester, on the* 15*th and* 16*th August,* 1853, *at the Cooper Street Institute. With Appendices.* London: Lumley, and Shorter, Hall of Association, 34, Castle Street East, Oxford Street.

4. *Five Years in the Land of Refuge; a Letter to the Members of the Council of the late Society for Promoting Working Men's Associations, now reconstituted under the title of the Association for Promoting Industrial and Provident Societies.* *By* JULES LECHEVALIER ST. ANDRÉ. 8vo. London: Richardson. 1853.

5. *Journal of Association,* 1852, *January to June.* London: Bezer.

6. *The Master Engineers and their Workmen. Three Lectures on the Relations of Capital and Labour; delivered by request of the Society for Promoting Working Men's Associations, at the Marylebone Literary and Scientific Institution, on the* 13*th,* 20*th, and* 27*th of February,* 1852. *By* J. M. LUDLOW, Esq., of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-Law. London: Bezer. 1852.

7. *The Christian Socialist,* Vols. I. and II. London: Printed by the Working Printers' Association. John Tupling, 320, Strand.

IN estimating the value of new schemes and theories, a great distinction must be drawn between the anticipation of final results, and the attempt at immediate measures. Nothing can exceed the folly of the recent talk of Peace Societies discouraging necessary armaments, and expecting to bring nations to a parley without a front of defence. Yet any one who will take the trouble to read Ramsden's Sermons on 'The Origin and Ends of Government,' and 'War and the Final Cessation of all Hostilities,' preached in the year 1800, and to follow the reflections they suggest, will learn to see as decidedly the

reasonableness of their ultimate hopes, as the absurdity of their present proposals. Something of the same kind may be said of the attempts and theories of recent years in the department of social organization. Principles are thrown out, and ideals contemplated, which it is impossible at once to realize; and absurd attempts are made at partial realization, under circumstances of impossibility, or in needless and pernicious hostility to existing institutions. Yet, a discerning eye may single out the elements of truth amidst this confusion, and a practical mind may haply succeed in combining them so as to produce growing and important results.

The science of political economy has, in fact, arrived at a stage of great interest, but of no small difficulty. It has, in great measure, exhausted one important field of labour and inquiry, but another, wider, more varied, and richer in practical fruits, is opening before it. The analysis of national wealth was necessary to the last generation in order to correct the enormous errors to which nations were liable in their attempts to increase or to preserve it. The greatness of those errors, and the extensive inconveniences resulting from them, have tended to give a negative character to the conclusions of scientific inquirers, and to direct their minds principally to those natural processes by which, according to their current maxim, 'while each man cares for himself, God provides for all.' And the truths they have elicited in the development of this principle are most wonderful and instructive, and open to our eyes a great design of our Creator, overruling to His own ends our selfish and short-sighted will. The grandeur of this view is sufficient to engage all the energy of a superior mind, and its apparent philosophical and religious character is such as to make it seem a worthy object of life to work it out to perfection, and such as even to give some countenance to the fallacy of its completeness. At the same time, the more subtle intellect finds still abundant amusement in the elaboration and criticism of definitions, while the practical and busy mind rejoices in the accumulation of statistics, and consoles itself for its own deficiencies by complaining of their imperfection.

It would be wrong, therefore, to say with some hasty reformers, that the old science of political economy is altogether dry and effete, and has nothing in it to reward inquiry. It is still necessary as a ground-work for more advanced and practical studies, and it has acquired a kind of classical precision, and almost demonstrative certainty, by the alternate application of genius and criticism. The 'Christian Socialists' themselves, in fair argument, admit no less. Mr. Ludlow, who is an uncompromising advocate of the rights of labour, observes: 'So long,

'therefore, as your competitive plutonomy confines itself to its 'scientific field, to its dead subject-matter of wealth, we socialists 'have to listen to it and learn from it.'[1] But the political economist, who is to be equal to the requirements of the coming age, must look out upon a wider field, and prepare to surmount new difficulties, in the hope of attaining results of still higher practical value, and still deeper theoretic interest. It is in this as in other cases; man first strives wildly against the powers of nature, and one while is swept away, another while succeeds through some favourable conjuncture. Then he studies those powers, and learns their course and sway, and discovers, perhaps, the easiest tracks or the safest periods for his journeys, his voyages, his operations, and understands the causes of the various calamities that threaten him if he mistakes his time or his path. But this is not his final state of knowledge. He aspires further to learn how to stem the currents, brave the winds, pierce the rocks, defy the seasons, and accomplish results which nature herself seemed almost to forbid. If, therefore, any science seems to lead us to strange and sad conclusions, to insurmountable difficulties and prospects of irremediable evils, we are not at once to sit down satisfied that so it must be, but rather to look round in every direction for resources, and not to give up the problems that meet us, till we have well tried every line of thought and of experiment in which a solution can possibly be found.

It will scarcely be denied that there are such cases in the science of political economy. The operation of the natural laws of competition confessedly leads to a great amount of pressure and distress in various quarters—distress, aggravated by the knowledge of its causes, and the general belief of a kind of fatal necessity in their operation. The evil may be less than that of violent interference, which deranges what might otherwise work well without giving any security for a real remedy for that which works ill. A compulsory fixed price, a compulsory rate of wages, and the like, may be very convenient to certain persons for a limited period, but if they are far from the natural standard they cannot hold long, and are sure first to produce great injury to some interest concerned, and then to bring the whole business with which they are connected to a stand still, so that, even if not utterly ruined, it cannot be restored to activity without a change. Hence has arisen the popularity of the maxim, '*Laissez faire*,' in political economy. It was good against the ill-judged attempts of ignorant legislators to promote agencies which they little understood, and to secure benefits

[1] Christian Socialism and its Opponents, (an Answer to the Edinburgh Review, &c.), p. 26.

of which they had limited and inaccurate views. While men excluded wealth in order to keep their hold of money, or tried to encourage productions by means which deprived them of a market, it was well to teach them that nature had her balancing and counteracting forces, and that any extreme effort in one direction was more likely to derange her actual working than to correct or improve it; but now that the working of nature is in the main understood, the system of non-interference is, in fact, the permission of a violent misuse of natural processes, and of advantage taken by the stronger through their means. And when we come to such results as the collision of whole classes of capitalists and labourers, and the consequent divulsion of labour from capital, to the imminent ruin of both; when we see markets alternately drained and glutted, bringing periodical returns of dizzy prosperity, insane speculation, and abject distress; and when we look at the miserable, and, for the time, impracticable resource of *transferring* capital and labour from a failing to a prosperous trade, we cannot but think that there is some reason in the argument of those who hold that '*Laissez faire*' is reduced to an absurdity. At any rate, let those who still hold the maxim, not quote it as a bar to any fair and natural efforts to obtain a remedy, but allow them at least to share its benefits.

On the one side it is said men will learn, as they get better informed and better educated, not to run into speculation so wildly as they do now; but still the same thing will occur in a certain degree, and the *principle of free action* requires that it must be so. On the other side it is said, if the principle of free action requires this, then the unqualified principle of free action is false, just as if it proved the three angles of a triangle to be less than two right angles. In like manner, when we consider the case of the provision of food, and observe that free competition will lead to occasional scarcities, and will only prevent entire exhaustion by an oppressive enhancement of prices, it is equally open to us to conclude on the one side that the evil must be endured, or on the other, that some provision may be made which will counteract the extreme effects of free competition. At least, those who hold it to be more humane, and more reasonable, and more in accordance with the rules of scientific investigation, to call in question the strict truth of a principle which leads to such inconvenient, and sometimes calamitous results, have a claim to a fair hearing, and to a full consideration of their several suggestions. It may be that they cannot at once offer any complete remedial system, but they are right in keeping the field of inquiry open by refusing to admit the conclusive rejection of any proposal on the simple ground that it would interfere with the freedom of competition.

This may, indeed, be a reason for avoiding rash experiments, especially on an extensive scale, like the *ateliers nationaux* of the late Provisional Government;[1] but it must not be taken as of absolute authority at once to stifle inquiry, and put a stop to thought. The classical political economist may 'wrap himself up in his own virtue,' and look with scorn upon the labours of the enthusiast, but he has no such mastery of the whole extent of moral and physical possibilities as to be able to pronounce those labours certainly fruitless, without at least a chance of being one day found in error.

Much less can he forbid the development of a principle which is now rapidly discovering its strength, and evolving incalculable resources from the depths of humanity, and from the hidden recesses of nature. It is premature to criticise; we can but draw attention to some of the leading facts which characterise the recent advances of the principle of Voluntary Association, and which indicate that it is possible that it may afford, ere long, an effectual remedy for some of the unavoidable evils of competition, and tend to supply a needful corrective to the practical theories of political economists. It may, perhaps, remain to be determined by experience whether the competitive system is of so elastic a nature as to admit the introduction of this principle like that of a new machine, or process of manufacture, or whether it will not rather have to retire within its own limits, and leave the main field in the possession of a more powerful as well as a more humane antagonist. Even in the first case its operation will probably one day be so far modified, that it might almost as well submit to change its name, so far as practical results are concerned, though it may keep it for the sake of theoretic truth.

It is, in fact, simply natural that where great evils are felt, men should seek a remedy; and the more complete the social organization becomes, and the keener the social feeling, the more readily do men resort to remedies of a friendly and forbearing character. Russia and Turkey are communities far less advanced in civilization, and humanized by habits of intercourse, than England and the United States; and it is accordingly for this, as well as for other reasons, much easier for the latter to adopt arbitration as the means of settling their disputes than for the former. In civilized Europe much more has been done of late by diplomacy toward the maintenance of peace than was accomplished in former generations; and there is no reason why the

[1] It is not true, as commonly supposed in England, that Louis Blanc was the author of this absurdity. It was not the offspring of a theory, but the resource of an administration embarrassed with an unemployed and dangerous multitude. The French socialists, however wild in some of their speculations, were too well acquainted with the necessary conditions of success to rely upon any such crude and really unorganized measures.

same spirit of accommodation and mutual adjustment of differences should not extend itself within each separate people, as it has done, in fact, in this country. The Sunderland shipwrights have made successful use of an arbitrative conference. Powerful companies have submitted their mutual differences to the arbitration of men of known character and ability. The House of Commons is a court of arbitration for many differing interests, although it becomes too much like a field of battle for those which are too powerful to be simply subject to Government; and if any methods can be invented by which classes having seemingly opposite interests can unite in mutual accommodation, such methods may take their place amongst the acknowledged combinations of political economy, may even fight their way under the system of 'competition,' levy troops against that mighty monarch in his own name, and, before men are well aware, usurp his throne.

The difficulties in the way of such an invention are not like those which stand in the way of a perpetual motion, but they may be somewhat analogous either to those of the north-west passage or of the Darien canal. The forces concerned are not all known and calculable: nor is it still a *desideratum* to find the living spring of untiring energy; human will and moral force are already involved in the problem, and the question is, whether they can overcome certain powerful material gravitations. It may be that this is possible only by an effort such as no organization hitherto imagined can maintain, or even such as human nature has not been made capable of maintaining. It may be only that an extent and concentration of energy is required beyond past example, but not beyond possibility, or the future prospects of reasonable hope. The oceans of capital and labour may, perhaps, be one day united, not merely by channels in which storms and ice-floes ceaselessly rush and jar, but by a calm and safe canal, whose waters peacefully ebb and flow between the solid banks of permanent institutions.

It must, however, be admitted, that what is so easily said is by no means easy to be done. One great difficulty arises, not only from the natural desire that all men have for liberty, but also from the indispensable value of the power of liberty in developing the faculties and energies of mankind.

Mr. Neale has justly observed that there is a danger to liberty in the system of industrial organisation:—

'Now the result of this exaggeration of the principle of common property must necessarily be, to destroy the independence of the individual—to turn the social union into a barrack-life, where every one is drilled and marched about, shaved, washed, dressed, given to eat, and to drink, sent to bed, and made to get up at the will of the majority; to strike at the root of family life, and to introduce a state of things which I conceive to be

altogether contrary to the true objects of social union ; and therefore it is that I am opposed to the doctrince of communism.'—*Letter in the Journal of Association*, p. 135.

It may seem out of place to refer to Apocalyptic prophecy in such a matter, but the tendency of strictly democratic socialism is to set up an authority such as that which is described in Rev. xiii. 16, 17: 'And he caused all, both small and great, 'rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right 'hand, or in their foreheads; and that no man might buy or 'sell, save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast, or 'the number of the name.'

Under colour of liberality, and suppressing invidious distinctions, a Democratic system might very probably interfere with individual religion, and deny civil rights to any one who would not consent to give up the education of his family in his own religious principles, or even the public profession of any distinct and dogmatic faith. But long before we come to this extreme tyranny, there may be a very strict rule imposed upon many of our proceedings, at least on the condition, of any employment by which we can earn a livelihood.

Even the workman must not expect that absolute freedom of choice as to where he will labour, and whether he will labour, which the possession of a few pounds now gives him, at least for the time, in a system which is to provide labour at a fair remuneration for every one who needs it. Labour it may provide, but choice of labour no system can provide beyond the limits of mutual use and consumption. Yet as some freedom in the choice of employment is valuable to the workman, and tends to his improvement, so is freedom of occupation and enterprise almost an absolute necessity for the more highly educated class, which no rational economist would dream of eliminating from society. Liberty, then, is a condition which must be preserved in any system that is to be productive of permanent good, and which cannot be rendered compatible with organization except by careful provisions for the purpose.

Another great difficulty is to obtain a sufficiently large area of combination for an effectual experiment. Any establishment acting upon a new principle is liable to the competition of those which proceed on the old methods; and one that gives fair wages may be undersold, for instance, by one which pays a lower remuneration for labour. This part of the problem might, perhaps, be solved by cooperative associations, if including men of superior mental power, and furnished with realized capital enough to undergo a temporary depression, since they could, in the long run, work at a cheaper rate than capitalists who had to enrich themselves as well as to support their labourers.

But cooperative associations may come into competition with each other, and in that case the competition will become far more depressing than the present power of capital in other hands. The general union of cooperative associations would secure a large basis, yet even upon this the mania of speculation could not be entirely defied; and if we imagine the still wider basis of a whole country, that country would still be liable to the competition of the world.

In any supplementary system, such as has been sometimes proposed in the form of a poor-law, there is the difficulty of interference with the trade of other portions of the community, unless the workmen employed can strictly, or almost strictly, be employed for one another. And the fact that food is the first necessary of life, renders the difficulty of effecting this by a poor-law greater than it would be in any voluntary combination, for it is almost of the nature of a poor-law to provide for a variable number of persons, while the production of articles of food requires a permanent occupation of the soil, and its perpetual cultivation, and every intermission causes a proportionate loss. This difficulty would be partially met by the direction of labour to the production of articles capable of being kept in store, and the maintenance of a considerable stock, capable of bearing any ordinary excess of demand without exhaustion.

Mr. Hole proposes the application of this plan to our harvests in general, and thinks that the community might do to greater advantage, and to a greater extent, what is now done by speculators at some risk, and with only partial benefit to the public. He thinks we might keep far ahead of consumption in our stock of corn, and thus in a greater degree equalize its price. This plan is inadmissible on the theory of absolutely free competition, since competition in the market would at once be crushed by an enormous reserve at the command of a public authority. Yet the benefit of almost absolute security against famine is one not to be despised, and it is an object worthy of laborious thought, and some trial of experiments, whether such a plan could not be made available at least to check those extreme variations which are a dubious and partial benefit even to the favoured class. Only the farmers whose capital was far below a reasonable standard, if even they, would be driven off the field by a more limited variation of price. And means ought to be taken for preventing unnaturally low as well as extremely high prices.[1] In fact large purchases in times of plenty would

[1] This must be understood relatively to the natural average. If produce can be permanently cheapened, while production is fairly remunerated, the ...ic cannot well forego the benefit.

almost do this of themselves, while they would provide for future dearth.

Yet this cannot be thrown out as a complete and digested plan for overcoming the present evils. There are ways by which, at present, it would be made far less effectual than it might at first sight appear to an enthusiast. And even the prevention of extreme temporary cheapness might operate to the detriment of the home producer by setting the foreign importer free from one of the risks to which he is now subject. Speculation, as long as it remains free, can still disturb any, even the wisest system, of regulating supply and demand. Nothing short of a power so paramount as actually to regulate prices could be entirely secure against such interference. And it would be useless to attempt an entire regulation of prices without a frumentary bank stocked for a Babylonian siege. Further objections might doubtless be raised against this or any similar arrangement, grounded upon the supposed permanency of some of the present conditions of society. But as it is not proposed at once to introduce any such measures, so it is not necessary to guard them against inconveniences which will be removed if the plans ever come into action through the processes of nature. Liberty must be maintained in some way or other, but we are not now sensibly the less free, because when we want to travel from London to Edinburgh we must go by railway or steamboat, instead of pack-horse, coach, or smack. If employment is rendered, as it may be, far more remunerative than it is at present, by a better division of labour, in an organized system, liberty will be at once increased and extended. Capital itself will have surer gains, though less chance of extravagant multiplication; enterprise may be somewhat limited in its range, but may probably be even forced into directions safer for private interest, as well as more conducive to public benefit. But the procedure by which these advantages are to be attained must be gradual, for several reasons. One of these is the high amount of integrity that will be required in the more responsible and confidential parts of such a social organization. Another is the necessity of having men trained and habituated even to the mechanical part of any new system. Again, every change interferes with existing interests, and is liable to cause extreme distress and injustice if hastily brought about. A more organized social economy might in some measure provide against this evil for the future, but ought not to give the worst example of it in its own introduction.

Mr. Hole, whose book contains too many home-truths to be passed unnoticed, although he has himself considered this point, writes sometimes in a way calculated to prevent its due con-

sideration by others. In one page he deprecates violence, and sudden reconstruction, in another he uses language and proposes plans calculated to excite the most violent passions on the one side, and the most determined hostility on the other. When he speaks of landlords 'restoring the land,' and the like, we cannot but expect that the cupidity of the multitude will be excited by the hope of immediate plunder, and the jealousy of the proprietor aroused to the utmost possible resistance. Even where he speaks of compensation, it is in connexion with a theory and a proposed measure which are liable to grave objections.

'A feudal system of landholding and a dense population are two such incongruous elements, that, we may rely upon it, the advent of the masses of the people of this country to power, will witness the destruction of the land-monopoly. It would be very desirable, could the mind of the people be prepared by a system of prospective legislation, to avoid alike the evils which must attend a sudden and violent re-distribution of the soil similar to those suffered by the French Aristocracy, and, at the same time, secure the supremacy of just and rational principles of landholding. We would on no account sanction the deprivation of the present owners of their interest in the soil, at all events not without complete compensation. That society has no right to inflict an evil to obtain a good, until all means have been tried to avoid that evil, is a principle as valid for landlords as it ought to have been held for hand-loom weavers. But this by no means excludes action on the future. As Mr. Mill justly observes, "the reason for not disturbing acts of injustice of old date, cannot apply to unjust systems or institutions, since a bad law or usage is not one bad act in the remote past, but a perpetual repetition of bad acts, as long as the law or usage lasts." A law whose action should not commence until all now living had quitted the scene of life, might be framed to secure those just rights of society which it ought never to have given up, and it could not be charged with injustice towards the descendants of the landlords, no longer brought up with the expectations of obtaining superior advantages at the expense of the community. The landlords enjoy the monopoly of the land upon sufferance, just as they did the monopoly of the Corn Laws. The land was never granted them with the acquiescence of those at whose expense it was given; and we have yet to learn that society, in resuming its rights, after protecting the interests of the present owners, would be guilty of spoliation or robbery.'—*Hole*, pp. 98, 99.

He would have no more land held by an individual than he has capital to cultivate, and this be let by the State, at the termination of every life-tenancy, to the highest bidder, an arrangement which requires strict examination when proposed by one who complains of *rent*. His answer would be, that the payer receives back through the State. But this would not prevent the rent from becoming, in some cases, oppressive, especially if the family of a deceased tenant were anxious to continue in occupation, and bid high on that account. It is conceivable, however, that it *might* answer to the State, if it had a proper organization in readiness for using its acquisition, to *purchase* the land its full value, at the demise of the present holders. But a

law of this kind could not now be introduced in England without something like a revolution, because the existing system has a hold not merely on the pride and greediness of a few, but on the feelings and interests of a very large portion, at least, of the community. It is regarded as the system of law and right, while the new scheme would be regarded as that of arbitrary will, and all-meddling tyranny. If the legislature were convinced of the probable feasibility of such a plan, it might be tried in a new colony, where there are no rights to be overthrown, or in such a case as that of the sale of encumbered estates in Ireland. The sudden adoption of an untried scheme, on the ground of a supposed indefeasible right, contrary to the practice of almost all nations from the beginning of the world, would be a monstrosity in legislation. And accordingly it would leave us no provision for the perpetuation of many influences which have hitherto been powerful agents in humanizing society.

Our forefathers did not do wrong in assigning land as they did. It was the procedure suited to their times; and though, like everything else, liable to abuse, it has borne good fruits. We have risen, under that system, to civilization and prosperity, and have at this moment twenty unfurnished Englands at our command for the expansion of our race, and, if we will, for the trial of our experiments. But we have used not only the hand of the material producer, but the head, the heart, and the life-blood of the educated gentleman. And we should do well to think, before we destroy the associations of ancient family homes, or the relations of ancient princely houses to their territorial dependents. England owes as much of her wealth, her peace, her prosperity, her greatness, and even her liberty, to her noble blood, as she does to her general native energy and power of will. Many a rural district thrives under the shadow of an immemorial line of nobles, and rejoices in the improvements constantly introduced by judicious landlords, where a mere race of farmers might have let ill alone for ages. It is not uncommon to see a landlord philanthropic and judicious in the management of his property, while it is comparatively rare to see a millowner careful of the welfare of his workmen. For genuine liberality and public spirit, the English aristocracy will bear comparison with any body of men placed in a position to be tried. And those who maintain that the use of them is to consume the finer articles of produce, do them grievous wrong. Not merely the mind of a statesman, but that of a good hearty country gentleman, is a product useful to society in a thousand ways, and well worth the expense at which it is raised. There are those who deserve the reproach—'In him we have lost a good ploughman,

and gained a useless foxhunter;'[1] but not every man that hunts a fox is thus to be set down for nothing but a hunter of foxes. Many a gentleman who is eager in the chase for a few days in the year, is also the steady promoter of public improvements, the example of his neighbourhood for honour and virtue, the friend of the poor, the maintainer of justice, and the centre of a happy and well-ordered society, who enjoy his possessions almost as if they were their own.

Mr. Hole has selected as his choice instance of aristocratic tyranny the late Duchess of Sutherland, whom he accuses of turning 26,000 people out of house and home, to convert their farms into sheep-walks, for the sake of rent.[2] We believe, that if he were to inquire a little more closely, he would find that the process of which he speaks was of a very different character. The Duchess, in fact, sacrificed her rents for many years to the improvement of her estates; built a great number of houses, made hundreds of miles of roads, encouraged fisheries, and took all possible pains to spare even the prejudices of the people. Middlemen, of course, were at a discount, and the privacy of the whisky-still was disturbed, but the census shows no trace of any vast migration, as it certainly would do if the statement were anything approaching to truth.

It will be an evil day for us when we think we can make all things new, and break the links of all our old associations in order to construct a system. Far better is the advice of Mr. Hole, in his Preface, which one would have thought he had written, contrary to usual practice, before he wrote his book, and afterwards forgotten it:—

'Compared with the proportions of the population embued with the sentiments and views of Socialism, the numbers in any way connected with Working Associations, Mechanics Institutes, Co-operative stores, Flour-mills, Freehold-land societies, and the like, form a small minority. Yet these contain the germ of those magnificent organizations which the world will one day witness. Enlarge and multiply these small associations, and combine them with each other. Growth is the law of Association, as of all Progress and Life—the imperfect preceding the highly developed. It is not the part of wise men to *wait* for the realization of large schemes, but to seize present opportunities and make the most of them. Each of these various movements is (often unconsciously to its promoters) working out the parts of a grand problem the solution of which can *only* be arrived at experimentally.

'The principle of Association, or co-operation, is susceptible of every degree of application, from the simplest assistance which two men agree to render each other, up to the highest and most refined combinations. There is no such thing as a perfected System of Association into which society has but to jump, and from which it shall at once reap all the advantages. The degree of association of which men are capable, depends on the height of moral and intellectual cultivation to which they may have attained. Try to

[1] Mr. Hole. [2] P. 95.

unite the more advanced principles of co-operation with men in a low degree of culture, and you will fail. As reasonably might one expect a nation of savages to co-operate in making laws or any refined social arrangements. They are obliged to resign themselves to the control of an individual mind. Hence autocracy is the best government for barbarous people. As men reach a higher culture, they require and obtain more liberal institutions. This principle, if fully understood, would tend to reconcile many discordant interests, and demonstrate the folly of agitation for extreme liberal opinions on the one hand, and extreme conservative ones on the other. Facts and experience are the demand, the reasonable demand, of the stubborn world. Fact must precede all sound theories and systems. Take, for example, the progress of railway communication. What an immense amount of knowledge now exists upon the subject! Every department, even the minutest, has been studied and tried by repeated experiments and calculations. Not an exigency arises, but ingenuity is racked to supply it. As soon as difficulties occur, they are obviated. But all this vast amount of knowledge could not have existed anterior to the construction of a railway. It was the emergency which developed the resources. No conclave of philosophers and engineers could have pre-arranged the railway system. The utmost they could do, would be to examine the fundamental principles,—to take as much care as possible that nothing entered into the first experiment which might mislead them: and the duty of society was not to stand gaping incredulously at the labours of the discoverers and inventors, still less to oppose them, but to lend its sympathy and aid as far as the object might reasonably appear to deserve it. In the same manner the principle of Association must pass through many phases, before its full value, and the right extent of its application, will become developed. Association in production, and Association in consumption, will doubtless exist as separate applications of the principle for some time. As practice develops the advantages of the system and exposes its weak points, the former will become increased, the latter remedied, until the principle has been carried to the greatest extent to which it can subserve human happiness.'—*Ibid. Introd.* pp. viii. ix.

But every one supposes the carrying out of his own favourite schemes to be an exception to general rules, and the measures which he has in view to be safe under circumstances which would be fatal to the success of less perfect legislation. It is something, however, for a writer of such a school to acknowledge, in any degree, the necessity of compensation for vested interests, of preparation for social changes, and of the gradual growth of new institutions. It would be too much to expect an appreciation of the higher refinements of individual and social culture, on the value of dogmatic truth. His book is worth reading to any real inquirer, who will neither blindly follow, nor blindly combat him, but look well to the problems he proposes, and to the general direction in which he seeks their solution. That he has yet found it, is more, perhaps, than he would himself avow, at least in sober thought and honest conviction. But the ignorant reader has no power of estimating difficulties, when once captivated with the first show of a system; and many may be deceived by the prospect of such a prize as the redistribution of the land, little aware that the land itself, seized by a hasty

process, might prove a useless gain, and that the best prospect to be expected from it for the many, on revolutionary terms, would be a bare subsistence, with no small probability of a famine as fatal as that which recently desolated Ireland.

Yet, if England is to flourish with her increasing population, there must be considerable improvements in the employment of land, through public institutions, beyond those which the natural course of supply and demand will necessarily introduce. There can be no gentle and self-working system of relief for the agricultural labourer under general depression without the command of a good extent of soil for cultivation.

It is certainly a defect in our present Poor-law, that it has so little provision for rendering the labour of the pauper productive. But we have yet to learn whether it may not be possible very much to narrow the limits of pauperism by a system of agriculture which will employ a large amount of human labour. On this head, Mr. Kingsley's Lecture on the Application of Associative Principles and Methods to Agriculture is very suggestive, though somewhat sanguine in its calculations. The amount to be gained by means of the manure collected and saved by his plan of building for labourers, seems at least to be over-stated. And it must not be forgotten, that if landlords or farmers do not advance the capital necessary for unprofitable production, somebody must advance it, and lose it too, or else that production will not take place. To do him justice, however, he does not require the whole country to spring at once into the system of maximum production, but rather recommends experiments on the application of associated labour, such as may be made with the consent of landlords, and by means of agreements with them. The great benefit of these methods would be, that the labourer would be enabled to obtain the benefit of that portion of his labour, which is not worth buying with wages, on which he could live. Suppose his labour during nine months of the year would bring in more than ten shillings per week, but in the remaining three months less. The farmer is willing to employ him while his labour produces a profit, but declines doing so as soon as its produce falls below the customary wages. Now, if he could gain only five shillings per week on an average during these three months, he would be a gainer by three guineas, which is a considerable sum to a labourer. Many liberal landholders do, in fact, give employment to men all the year round, taking some loss of this kind rather than allow them to be either pauperised, or starved and demoralised for nt of employment.

\ very interesting attempt has been made in Holland, of ch some account is given in Mr. Senior's work on Foreign

Poor-laws and Labourers, and more recently in M. Ducpetiaux's Report to the Belgian Government on Agricultural Colonies. Our thanks are due to M. Ducpetiaux, and to Prof. Vreede, of Utrecht, for recent information. The scarcity of 1816-17 gave occasion to the formation of the *Maatschappy van Weldadigheid*, or Philanthropic Society, more literally *Société de la Bienfaisance*, which at one time numbered 20,000 subscribers. The plan of its founder, General van den Borsh, was to purchase lands on the heaths of the northern provinces, Drenthe, Overyssel, and Friesland, to be cleared and cultivated by paupers, who were by degrees to work out the expense of their settlement, and become free colonists. The expense of settling a family of eight persons and stocking nine acres of land was estimated at 1,700 florins, or a little over 140*l.*, part of which they were to repay, and afterwards to pay a rent for the farm they had brought into cultivation, and which had of course been much improved in value by their labour. One of the establishments, at Ommerschans, has a sort of penal settlement for the suppression of mendicity. The Society undertakes to relieve the country of a certain number of poor, or vagrants, as the case may be, at a given rate of payment, varying according to their ability to work. Few families have as yet completely earned their emancipation. The calculations have proved too favourable, and the Society has been compelled to mortgage its estates to their full value, besides receiving large assistance from the Government. Such assistance has, however, been continued, and the plan is considered useful, though not successful. The country has to contend with a vast amount of pauperism, which neither these nor any other means have as yet succeeded in reducing. But these colonies have lessened the evils of the local depôts of mendicity, which were more expensive, and less favourable to the physical and moral condition of the paupers. The very unsatisfactory financial condition of the colonies may be accounted for by the fact, that they are managed by a committee which sits at the Hague, seventy or eighty miles off, and that their system of agriculture is rather of a wooden character. M. Ducpetiaux notices, for instance, the mistake of settling single families at once in single cottages or single farms, instead of commencing by employing gangs in clearing the land. But this is only one of a series of errors almost inseparable from that species of management. The experiment of associated farming is not fairly tried until it is made with at least average labourers. Not only mendicants, but refuse labourers, are incapable of giving it a fair chance. And if it succeeds, when once fairly carried out, it will give great elasticity to the market for labour in general. Mr.

Kingsley has pointed to great possible results in the way of spreading population over the country, and locating manufactures also in less crowded districts. But this requires a general associative system of industry, otherwise the convenience of sale will draw all unavoidably to centres.

The failure of many attempts is no proof that communities might not be formed, on the basis of mutual cooperation, capable of conducting jointly almost the whole process of social life. The error has been in the attempt to construct the whole at once, or waiting for it to start at once into existence. It is the nature of a living body to grow from a germ. The empires of the world have been, without exception, the developments of petty principalities. Even the United States of America could no more have formed themselves at once, out of unconnected elements, into what they now are, than a million of molehills could jump at once into a mountain. And in their very existence and growth, they afford a proof that the associative faculty is stronger in the civilized state, and in the Saxon race, than it has proved in the earlier history of the world, and in other portions of mankind. But even with this advantage, a permanent association must grow from a germ, and extend itself by degrees, both in numbers, and in the amount of the interests which each member entrusts to it. The great difficulty consists in the need of patience in waiting for results. The sanguine promoters of a new scheme promise benefits which do not come fairly within the scope of their original terms, and every one is eager to profit at once by combinations which can only bring in their fruit in the course of years. The consequence is, that many benefit societies, many of what might be useful companies, fall to the ground without ever making fair trial of the system of cooperation. It is only men of some education, and prudence, and mutual confidence, who can successfully act together. And it is not always enough even for men to see that it is their own interest to do right. There are too many in whom passion overbears interest, and sacrifices permanent benefit to its own temporary ends. Otherwise there would not be so many who are not possessed of that most valuable element of success in life—a good character.

But, with all these difficulties in its way, the system of association gains ground. Not only are theories on the subject embraced by thousands, who wait or strive for impossible conditions in order to realize them, but practical and efficient unions are formed by limited bodies of men, congregated under favourable circumstances. The Legislature itself has seen the necessity of meeting this tendency of society, by giving fresh facilities of legal associations, although much remains to be done in the way

of improving the law of partnership, before the way is open to some of the most hopeful experiments. The preamble and first clause of the Act of last session, will give some notion of its objects. A fresh Act is proposed for the limitation of liabilities in certain cases of partnership, which would give additional facilities:—

'*An Act to legalize the Formation of Industrial and Provident Societies*, 15 & 16 *Vict. c.* 31. 30*th June*, 1852.

'WHEREAS, by an Act passed in the Thirteenth Year of the Reign of Her present Majesty, intituled *An Act to consolidate and amend the Laws relating to Friendly Societies*, it was enacted, that a Society might be established under the Provisions of the said Act for any of the Objects therein mentioned; that was to say, (amongst other Objects,) "for the Relief, Maintenance, and Endowment of the Members, their Husbands, Wives, Children, and Kindred;" "and for the frugal Investment of the Savings of the Members, for better enabling them to purchase Food, Firing, Clothes, or other Necessaries, or the Tools or Implements of their Trade or Calling, or to provide for the Education of their Children or Kindred, provided (amongst other things) that the Shares in any such Investment should not be transferable:" And whereas, various Associations of Working Men have been formed for the mutual Relief, Maintenance, Education, and Endowment of the Members, their Husbands, Wives, Children or Kindred, and for procuring to them Food, Lodging, Clothing, and other Necessaries, by exercising or carrying on in common their respective Trades or Handicrafts; and it is expedient to extend the Provisions of the said recited Act to such Associations, and otherwise to regulate the same: Be it therefore enacted by the Queen's most Excellent Majesty, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the Authority of the same, as follows:

'I. It shall be lawful for any Number of Persons to establish a Society under the Provisions of this and the said recited Act, for the Purpose of raising by voluntary Subscriptions of the Members thereof a Fund for attaining any Purpose or Object for the Time being, authorized by the Laws in force with respect to Friendly Societies, or by this Act, by carrying on or exercising in common any Labour, Trade, or Handicraft, or several Labours, Trades, or Handicrafts, except the working of Mines, Minerals, or Quarries beyond the Limits of the United Kingdom of *Great Britain* and *Ireland*, and also except the Business of Banking, whether in the said United Kingdom or elsewhere: and this Act shall apply to all Societies already established for any of the Purposes herein mentioned, so soon as they shall conform to the Provisions hereof.'

At the end of M. St. André's volume is a list of associations and associative stores in above 100 different places, which is enough to show that the principle is really at work, and that this legislation is not for mere imaginary cases. At present, however, the persons who are thus associated are generally but beginners in the system, and have much to learn about its true principles and possible development. Such associations may be formed for the mere purpose of gaining some immediate advantage, without any view to more extensive cooperation, and

equal dealing with others as well as with their own members. M. St. André, whatever may be his enthusiasm, or his over-estimate of what can be done with men as they are, appears to have the merit of a sincere desire to draw associations together in a spirit of unselfish cooperation, and at the same time to place them in a healthy connexion with the external body of society, and, where it is possible, with the Church, so as to direct their efforts into safe and effectual channels. There are too many among the leaders of such movements who consider religion and existing governments as mere obstacles in the way of a reconstruction of society according to their own views. But it is satisfactory to see that there are at least some who are aware of the advantage that every real social reform must derive from the protection of the civil power, and the infusion of moral life through Church membership and religious education. The following letter is sufficiently intelligible to the uninitiated, to give some little notion of M. St. André's position and views:[1]—

'*To the Members, Friends, and Supporters of Working Men's Associations, and of Co-operative Stores.*

'"No man having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God."—ST. LUKE, ix. 62.

'*Mr.*

'Having resigned, in the beginning of March last, the management of the *Central Co-operative Agency*, at 76, Charlotte-street, Fitzroy-square, which had been entrusted to me by Mr. Edward Vansittart Neale, the founder of that establishment, and the dissolution of partnership, as regards myself in the late firm, Lechevalier, Woodin, Jones and Co., now carried on under the title Woodin, Jones and Co., having been gazetted on the 13th of April last, I always considered it my duty to address you and the friends of co-operation and industrial reform in England, on that occasion, as I did last year, when business was begun.

'Nevertheless, I have, up to this day, delayed fulfilling such intention, as my address to you could answer no useful purpose, until I was ready to show what further step I meant to take for the advancement of co-operation and industrial reform.

---

[1] It is scarcely to our immediate purpose to give any account of his earlier life, or of his plan for applying the principle of association to the solution of the difficulties of the abolition of slavery in French Guiana, by means of a Company, which was accepted by the Government of Louis Philippe in January, 1848, and fell to the ground in consequence of the Revolution. (See his Letter to the Extraordinary Delegates of the British West India Colonies.) He has passed through the St. Simonian and Fourierist schools, and attained to more practical views by long experience and observation, of which some evidence may be found in the commencement of his Report on the British Colonies, published some time since by the French Government It is remarkable, that in one way or other, the St. Simonians in general have returned to the Church; and it is perhaps an additional proof of a catholic spirit that one, not the least able and devoted of them, should have found a home in the Church of England, and a satisfactory field of labour under the shadow of the British Constitution, and with the most earnest purpose of spreading amongst classes now but too much disposed to disaffection, a rational attachment to the British Government.

'It is gratifying to me to think that none of you might have ever plausibly entertained the idea that, leaving for any motive any especial co-operative establishment, I had left altogether the field of my permanent exertions since 1829, at a time when, and in a country where the facts of the present and the prospects of the future are so satisfactory, and the method adopted to carry out the realization of industrial reform according to the great principle of co-operative association, so conformable to my views, and so well adapted to the little amount of practical wisdom experience has taught me.

'In the prospectus of the *Central Co-operative Agency*, the following four principles have been set forth:—

'"1st. That trade, exchange, distribution of goods, are trusts to be administered alike in the mutual interest of producers and consumers, not to be conducted as matters of speculation.

'"2d. That any adulteration, fraud, and falsehood of any kind, in price, quantity, or quality, is a misdemeanour, and should be dealt with as such by public opinion, and by each individual privately, in the absence of law.

'"3d. That the most legitimate and efficient means which the wealthier classes have for aiding the working men, and both the wealthier classes and the working men for aiding the poor out of employment, is to secure their consumption to co-operative establishments, by giving their orders through a regular channel, acting under an especial responsibility for the purpose.

'"4th. That an equitable and freely-accepted arbitration between producers and consumers, and the regulation of supply and demand according to the co-operative principle, should be substituted for the arbitrary and selfish power of private speculation."

'These principles are, in my opinion, a clear and complete summing up of anything wise and practicable to be gathered up from that part of the efforts of science, since the beginning of this nineteenth century, relating especially to substituting co-operative and emulative association to conflicting competition, in industrial and commercial transactions.

'In a public address, which was delivered at the meeting of proprietors, depositors, and customers of the London Co-operative Stores, held in the board-room of the establishment, 76, Charlotte-st., Fitzroy-sq., on the 30th of May, 1851, and whereof the report has been printed and widely circulated, I made also the following statement:—

'"As to the views of the Central Co-operative Agency, they were not, properly speaking, founding a co-operative store, but an institution intended to realize certain objects, among which he might single out as one of no ordinary importance, *the education of an improved body of distributors*, the first step towards a successful realization of the idea of a superior system of distribution.

'"Now, could they imagine that this class was not as interesting as any other class of working men? The trustees and partners felt, if not more, certainly the same, interest for this class as they did for any other class of working men; and, consequently, it was their intention to admit such persons to participate in some benefits which they did not enjoy under the old system of trade. Though by the constitution of the new Central Agency they could not be made associates any more than the customers, yet an *Association of Shopmen* could be formed, and a *Conference* instituted to train them in the principles upon which the central agency intended to carry on business.

'"The establishment would thus, by the stimulus of immediate self-interest, endeavour to show these young men that it was better to work on the new principle than on the old one."

'I have always considered the making of active efforts to carry out the numbers 3 and 4 among the four principles above quoted, and to organize an *association of shopmen*, and a *conference* particularly devoted to the same class of people, as being my especial province in the institution, called the *Central Co-operative Agency*.

'Without any view of underrating the great good which has already been done, and is still doing through the instrumentality of that establishment, I may say that the points just alluded to have been almost entirely omitted in the zealous and successful exertions made by the Trustees and Partners of the *Co-operative Agency* to promote its development.

'Had this not been the unavoidable result of the capital of the establishment having other more immediate employment, and of certain *external* obstacles, the principal responsibility of any fault should fall upon me, as I acknowledge that attending to those points was my especial duty in the management of the *Co-operative Agency*.

'In fact, experience having shown that the two first items of our common views of commercial reform were carried out as satisfactorily as possible, in the present arrangements of the *Co-operative Agency*, whilst the other points remained forcibly unattended to, I felt myself bound, at the cost of some hardship, to try to do, in some other way, but to the profit of the general co-operative movement, what could not be elsewhere effected.

'Such have been, as far as public interest is concerned, the motives of my withdrawal.

'Now, it was no slight difficulty for me to find and to prepare the new framework of practical action, whereby I could promote the objects I have more particularly in view, in benefitting, at the same time, the existing Co-operative Stores and Associations of working men, whatever may be the defects of their present constitution.

'After mature consideration, leaving for another especial effort what is to be done regarding the *Provident Institution*, and *Educational Conference* for shopmen, I have resolved to take up and to work out by means of a new institution, to be called the *Board of Supply and Demand*, the third point set forth in the programme of industrial reform which I have framed, and which I will endeavour, by all proper means, to carry into execution. This third point is as follows:—

'"That the most legitimate and efficient means which the wealthier classes have for aiding the working men, and both working men and the wealthier classes for aiding the poor out of employment, is to secure their consumption to co-operative establishments, by giving their orders through a regular channel, acting under an especial responsibility for the purpose."

'I enclose the first draft of the above-named establishment, (*Board of Supply and Demand*,) and will be thankful in receiving your friendly communications and suggestions.

'I beg to subscribe myself, yours obediently,

'JULES LECHEVALIER ST. ANDRE,

'Late Manager of the Central Co-operative Agency, at 76, Charlotte-street.

'London, 6, Charles-street, Soho, July 24th, 1852.'

It will be seen from this letter, that he has been connected with the cooperative movement in which Mr. F. D. Maurice and Mr. Vansittart Neale have taken a conspicuous part; and that he has been led to separate from them by some differences of opinion with respect to the management of their institution, although still anxious to promote their general ends.

The main object of his book is to explain *to them* the princi-

ples on which he felt it his duty to insist, and the non-recognition of which caused him to separate from them. In his view a place and influence are assigned to *capital*, as a distinct and legitimate species of property, which some of those who are simply eager to advance the condition and power of 'working men,' in the sense of actual artisans and mechanics, are not disposed to allow. And he desires, also, such an organization as may tend to the relief of *all classes* of operatives, and to their friendly combination with capitalists, masters, shopmen, and consumers. To some persons the very largeness of his schemes will appear conclusive against their practicability. But it remains to be tried whether he has really hit upon the germ which can be developed so as finally to embrace them all. If so, their extensive and varied character is only a necessary provision for their successful operation in a complicated order of society. His 'Letter' explains the documents contained in his Appendix, and gives each an intelligible place. The latter part of it is that which gives an idea of his constructive plans; the former relates rather to the principles on which he is at issue with some English promoters of the system of cooperation.

A Letter to the Clergy and Laity, circulated some time since, points out what he considers the most hopeful direction for efforts in the cause of association and of mutual fair dealing:—

'The object to which I would call your attention is the great importance of forming an Industrial Institution, with the view of securing the operation of sound social and commercial principles, and of counteracting the demoralizing practices now prevailing in trade.

'My application to you involves, consequently, this all-important question: "Has the Church, have Churchmen, anything to do with industrial matters; and what have they to do, at a time like the present, when such dangerous conflicts have arisen between the various interests at stake?"

'Not only as being conversant with the science of political and social economy, to which more than twenty years of my life have been devoted, but as a Catholic Churchman, I state distinctly the following propositions:—

'1. That an active interest in industrial matters is to be numbered among the practical duties of the Catholic Church, and used to be recognised as an important concern wherever the Church was in a normal state of development and ascendancy; witness, "the controversies and decisions of the Church regarding the rate of interest; the guilds, halls, and corporations still existing in England; the immense share which the religious orders and the Church's Missionaries had in the progress of agriculture, art, science, industry, and mechanics, all over the world."

'2. That the present state of industrial relations is entirely inconsistent with the moral principles of the Church, and renders it all but impossible for the great bulk of the people to conform to her discipline, submit to her teaching, and attend to her ceremonies.

'3. That such a state of things has resulted from the Church having left theoretically uncontradicted by her teaching, and practically uncounteracted by such institutions and businesses as should have been supported by her members, the growing and working of an anti-social principle,

assumed to be that of a new science, namely, "That individual will and personal strength are the only rules of industrial business, and that every one must be left to himself in the fight of life."

'4. That the working of so false a principle has created in the commercial life of society a kind of disease, which has communicated itself to the Church, as the spiritual centre of social life; and, in a greater or less degree, has perverted almost every conscience, within or without the pale of the Church, as regards the mode of dealing with one's neighbour.

'5. That the most active cause of unbelief and impiety is at work now in the industrial world, as it was formerly in the scientific and philosophical world, and consequently, that one of the best remedies against unbelief and impiety, is to be found in such action of the Church as may contradict the false principles and counteract the bad practices prevailing in industry, trade, and commerce.

'6. That the counteracting influences which the Church has so successfully exerted against false rationalism, false science, and false philosophy, are now to be directed against the frauds, falsehoods, and mischiefs of trade and industry.

'7. That to contend that the Church has neither the duty nor the power of advising, and setting good examples, in matters connected with production, distribution, and consumption of wealth, and with the daily labour of men earning their daily bread, amounts to the same as depriving the Church of her most powerful means of preventing evil and effecting good.

'8. That it is the obvious duty of Churchmen, in their business and financial relations, to carry out the principles of Christian righteousness.

'9. That although it be neither possible to obtain, nor desirable to ask for new legislative enactments in such matters, it is the province of the Church, or at least of Clergymen and Laymen individually, to apply thereto as much as they can of their own moral influence.

'10. That to this end, the most efficient and the least objectionable means of action, both for Clergy and Laity, consists, just now, in concentrating custom and consumption, and in directing them through the proper channel, in order to introduce Christian morality in trade, industry, and commerce.

'The manner in which that knowledge has come to my mind, may serve as a hint of mighty importance to Catholic Churchmen.

'When I came to a clearer perception than I ever had before of the truth and inexhaustible fecundity of the Catholic faith, and of Church institutions, I had no difficulty in acknowledging the dangerous errors, either theological, moral, or economical, accumulated in the various doctrines forming, under the name of Socialism, the chaos from which the Church has to bring forth one of the Divine promises: "Et renovabis faciem terræ." But this I could not deny, namely, that the mutual relations of men in their business life had to be regulated by the same moral principles as those prevalent in other spheres of life, and that it was an untenable contradiction to hear inside the Church, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself," and to see going on outside a permanent warfare of conflicting interests, and to hear economists, Christian men, engrafted by baptism into the body and Church of Christ, professing the false principle which is acted upon by Christian nations at large: "Thou shalt sell to thy neighbour as dear as thou canst, and buy from him as cheap as thou canst, in direct ratio of thy strength, compared with his inability or weakness."

'I then acknowledged that I had been kept away from the Church and attracted elsewhere, because with Socialism I had the clear promise of a terrestrial order, concordant, as far as possible, with the principles of charity and justice implanted in my mind by Christian teachers, and a binding prescription to facilitate by all means the gradual realization of that order of things; whilst, in the practical course of life, the Christian

teachers themselves, and the Christian world, had no other example to set before me than their bowing down to a pretended science of political economy, which pretended science asserts as its essential dogmas—that the relations of men in business have no better rule than the competitive fight of individuals against each other;—that the industrial economy of human society is exclusively dependent upon external and natural laws, as immutable and as far above the reach of human power, as the movements of the physical world.

'It became then as clear to my mind as daylight, that the most active cause of distrust towards the Church among the working classes, and the so-called free-thinkers, was to be found in her adhesion to, or at least her indifference towards, the satanic selfishness and individualism fostered by political economy; whereas the first cause of the failures of Socialists, either in framing or in applying their theories, was this very distrust towards the Church, and a misconception of her principles, on account of the apparent opposition of those principles to a more righteous mode of regulating the business relations of men.'

The first paper in his Appendix contains a proposal of this kind made to the '*Society for Promoting Working Men's Associations;*' and the second is a criticism upon it by a person of some acuteness, but one who underrates the rights of capital, and one who perhaps reckons too little upon the growth of men in connexion with growing institutions. He is, nevertheless, right in considering the very general character of the attempt, in connexion with the stringent rules of internal operation, as somewhat premature. It requires, however, something more than the powers of a Babbage to arrange a perfect system of mutual compatibility in moral and intellectual movements. Reformers must proceed on faith, and introduce a good principle in the most elastic and expansive form they are able. Many of them might profit by a week's study of the preparations illustrative of the origin and course of animal life in an anatomical museum. Some day, perhaps, we shall have tables illustrative of the analogous processes of the formation of empires, polities, and institutions. Meanwhile they will work on, finding their way, like rudimentary organizations, to their maturity; growing, man scarce knows how.

It is easy to criticise each instance of the cooperative system, and to point out where it will fail of a complete result. And doubtless there will be many futile experiments; some, perhaps, disastrous. Yet there is moral value and strength in the principle, and there is the authority of the first love of the Christian Church for its consistency with every divine law of duty, though not for its obligation, or even for its practicability at any given period and in any given place. Those who think that they utterly reject the principle, act upon it freely and effectually in the formation of all sorts of joint-stock companies, partnerships, voluntary societies, clubs, mutual benefit or insurance societies, colleges, institutes, and combinations that defy

the Dictionary. The introduction of a moral element into this system is simply decried as opposed to the maxims of Political Economy, while it is, in fact, an advance in Political Economy, and just the very thing for which the investigations of Political Economy have been clearing the ground. It is observed by one of the Christian Socialists,[1] that the object of that science is not mere wealth, but 'the production of man, and man in a continually higher condition.' It is not the immediate object, but such is doubtless the end of Political Science in general, and, consequently, that to which Political Economy should be made subservient. The aim of the cooperative reformation is in this direction. If it is not effectual, the reason can be no other than that men are not yet good enough for it.

Political Economy shows that wages, profits, and the like, tend, through competition, to a minimum. And the only thing that can keep this minimum above a miserably low figure in a full country, is the education of the masses to such a point as shall make them more desirous of a certain amount of comfort and respectability, than of the immediate indulgences which prevent their attaining it. Whatever some hard-headed economists may say, it is not very likely that prudence will much check the increase of population. But it is quite reasonable to expect that the great body of the people might be so well instructed as to be desirous of making some provision before marriage, and to enter upon that state at the age, perhaps, of thirty, pronounced seasonable by Hesiod in a climate where maturity is somewhat earlier than in our own, with the prospect of bringing their children into the world at no extreme disadvantage. This moderate exercise of prudence, with some care to save in prosperous times, would keep whole populations from the state of filth, starvation, and misery, to which they are too often reduced.

Better education would also facilitate the mutual good understanding of masters and workmen, by making the latter better able to comprehend the position of the former, and to appreciate the risks and anxieties, which are no small counterpoise to their sometimes extravagant but uncertain gains. So much, indeed, may be hoped from this, that it is possible to conceive of the entire self-correction of our social state. But the force of the mania of speculation, and its tendency to disturb the best supposable state of things, really forbids that hope, and drives us rather to look to some positive organization for a power which may overbear the utmost competitive efforts of individual or combined capital and credit, and may hold a steady control over the process of distribution.

[1] Christian Socialist, No. 12, vol. i. p. 89.

Meanwhile, neither our own country nor any other in the world is full; and we shall do much more wisely to encourage the emigration of those who do not readily find fitting employment at home, than to set all to work in our own country at a disadvantage, by a new distribution of land. It is true that more people might here force a pittance from the unwilling soil, though a pittance it would be. It is true that much might be done by clearing waste lands. But it is equally true that the peasantry, who have in some instances been removed from places where they contrived barely to exist, would find a far larger portion of the comforts of life in another hemisphere, than they could have enjoyed by the most liberal arrangements of tenure in their native land. If their removal is made a charge against their landlords, let it be on the score of local attachment and patriotic sentiment, and not on that of material comfort. When all the world is so full that we begin to want elbow-room, and raise our fields upon arches in order to place dwellings under them, we will terrace the sides of Ben Nevis, and repeat on all our cliffs and mountains the 'Gun Gardens' of Beachy Head, or the hanging vineyards of the Rhine. Till then, we shall do better to use first the fertile plains, where we find them open, and to pass round the territory of Brother Esau, if he grudges us even his highway, and a purchased draught at his wells.

There is enough in the present aspect of the cooperative system to encourage those who are anxious for social improvement to look mainly in that direction for success, and to endeavour, as much as possible, to engage capital as well as labour on its side. A *law*, or even a general arrangement, under present circumstances, for the sharing of profits by workmen is a mere chimera; but a voluntary combination, which shall give them a certainty of some proportionate and fair remuneration, is a problem, however difficult, yet not by the very conditions of the case impossible. It is one which will be worked out in cooperative agencies where the capital comes mainly from a few, and the work from others, and a solution may be thus obtained which is applicable to the case of a master's arrangements with workmen in a factory which is wholly his own property. One of the main difficulties at present lies in a jealousy which makes reductions impracticable when they are necessary, and renders advances dangerous when they are reasonable. But the idea of sharing profits implies that of sharing losses, and workmen must earn their right to profits by submitting to labour at lower rates than the full wages when this is necessary. There is some difficulty in making arrangements for rendering this compulsory, but it might be done by a system of engagements, the breach of which should be equivalent to bankruptcy, and should

disable the defaulting workman from obtaining similar advantages elsewhere.

An entire regulation of the market, preventing either glut or exhaustion, is a mighty problem, from which we must as yet retire, yet it is only the 'problem of the Three Bodies,'—Capital, Labour, and Demand. The action of the well-informed public through the last of these may one day prove of the utmost importance in the history of our social institutions. Even a little foresight in giving orders, sufficient to avoid unduly hurrying workpeople, is now a great social benefit, but much more may be done by a more general system. It is by this means that a moral force can be brought to bear upon the powers of supply, in aid of any moral development of them from within. And although there may be follies and delusions which may captivate earnest minds, and turn aside many a sovereign from its most advantageous course, yet it is thus that the really successful schemes, which introduce effectual social reforms, will be nourished and fostered in their origin, and advanced to such strength as will enable them to make their own way to general adoption. The work is worth the waste, if the principle has any life and reality in it. And whether it has or not, a very few years will decide; though it may take many to accomplish what man's avarice and wilfulness must ever strongly resist, and what requires new and unknown arrangements to reconcile it even with the encouragement of enterprise and the maintenance of liberty.

That a real beginning has been made in the introduction of the cooperative principle into general trades and manufactures, cannot be questioned after a review of the reports of the Working Men's Association. It existed already, in joint-stock companies, for the class of capitalists, and in unions of masters, and of workmen. The step which may ultimately lead to comprehension of classes was taken when workmen began to unite in forming establishments for themselves. As these grow in wealth and importance, they must find a place for capital, and allow its due influence, and they must secure steadiness of management, by some plan of continuing it in the hands of individuals or small bodies. Nor can they fail, in the course of extensive operations, to find out the real value of master-minds. At present we find them talking of doing without masters, and while they do so the common remark is, that their work will be 'cheap and nasty.' Any well-regulated system will acknowledge property, and will also acknowledge the value of God's gifts in the way of mental endowment to each individual. They are as much his own as his hands, and as really, sometimes as calculably, productive. The great danger to the coopera-

tive *principle* lies in the probability of those which are most successful becoming by degrees mere joint stock companies, the profits of which are monopolised by the first associates as proprietors, while the general interests of labour are neglected as soon as these individuals rise a little above the level of the labouring class. Should this be universally the case, the period of any general improvement in social relations by means of cooperation will be indefinitely deferred, unless other associations of a more comprehensive character can be formed, and a higher moral influence introduced.

The following extracts, especially the latter, show a good amount of common sense and resolution, but they do not indicate any prevailing disposition to look beyond the relative interest of a single class:—

'One portion of the labours of the Society which cannot be overlooked, has reference to its relations with Trade Societies. Trade Societies, the legal recognition of which dates from the Act for the Repeal of the Combination Laws, and the utility of which is proclaimed by modern political economists, are the only real organization yet remaining amongst the working-classes, since the downfall of the guilds of the middle ages. It had been one of the most anxious wishes of many members of the Society, from the earliest period of its existence, to convert this organization to the purpose of co-operation, so as to suppress the very possibility of strikes, by leading the trade societies to devote to the employment of productive labour the sums which are now spent by them, for the defence of the class-interest of the worker, in maintaining men in unwilling idleness. Several efforts were made from time to time by various members of the Society, especially by Mr. Lloyd Jones and Mr. Walter Cooper, and afterwards by the Central Co-operative Agency, to effect this end in particular cases. The now well-known "Amalgamated Society,"—the most important trade society of the kingdom, was amongst those that were conferred with (and in this instance, by its own seeking) on the subject, nor did any other similar body show greater inclination towards Co-operative views.

'When the great dispute in the Iron-trades broke out, the Society could not fail to feel a deep interest in it. On the one hand, the doctrines put forth in the "Representation of the case of the Employers of Operative Engineers," of the master's right to do what he liked with his own, when he had once bought his labour by a "lawful bargain," excited its strongest reprobation, as being opposed to all those principles of mutual dependence and mutual justice which it had been endeavouring to inculcate. On the other hand we could not but be deeply pained to see a contest, in which so much of right was on the side of the working-men, assume in its progress more and more the fruitless character of other similar disputes, and vast funds, which might have employed many a willing hand in co-operative labour, exhausted once more in the effort to maintain thousands in idleness. On the whole, our duty as a Society seemed to be to stand by, and, as far as might be, to secure justice for the working-men by enlightening opinion; —above all, to strive to turn the dispute, whatever might be its issues, to the advantage of the cause of fellow-work;—and in the meantime, to leave individual members of the Society to the exercise of their own discretion, as to the part which they might take in the matter, and the advice which they might give to either party.

'There were not wanting those amongst us upon this occasion who

sought to impress upon the working engineers the need of immediate surrender, as the most useful, the greatest, the most solemn protest against the dictation of their employers,—that of avowed weakness yielding to brute force. Others tried hard, with small luck be it confessed, to obtain friendly mediation between the two belligerent parties, and received full gladly, side by side with the working-men, the insults of the newspaper press. One and all, we believe, are fully prepared to justify their conduct, and know well that even where accused of stirring up war they were in reality "seeking peace and ensuing it" by every means in their power. But the Society, we repeat it, as such, did not and could not engage in the conflict. All it could do was to organize a series of lectures, six of which were delivered on successive Friday evenings, from the 13th of February to the 20th of March, at the Marylebone Literary and Scientific Institution, 17, Edward Street, Portman Square, the three first by Mr. Ludlow, the two next by A. H. Louis, Esq., (ordinary member of the Council) and the last by Mr. Neale. We are bound to admit that, from various causes, (the night amongst others being badly chosen,) these were in general but thinly attended. The three first and last have been published.

'But the success of the "Masters' Strike" has been the triumph of Co-operation. A hundred thousand pounds may have been wasted, or the opportunity of earning them foregone, by the working-men. But we have every reason to hope that it is for the last time that such an expenditure will take place. The Amalgamated Society has declared in favour of co-operative labour, and revised its laws so as to make the reproductive employment of its members the very hinge of its proceedings. The National Association of United Trades has proclaimed that "the time has come for the entire abandonment of strikes and turn-outs as a means of protecting labour," and that "the only thing left" is, in future, "to organize and carry out a self-supporting co-operativere productive system of employment." Out of the strike in the engineering trade itself, many associations of working-engineers, including the flourishing "East London Iron Works" and "Atlas Company" in London, have sprung up; and throughout the country many and many a trade society is engaged in discussing the propriety of entering upon co-operative labour, and availing itself of the provisions of the new act.'—*First Report of Working Men's Associations, pp.* 12—14.

'That men may truly work together, three things are indispensable, that they should exercise justice to each other, in the division among the producers of the proceeds of any work which many are jointly engaged in producing, and in the exchange of one kind of work for another; and that they should be ready to promote whatever conduces to the common advantage or enjoyment. These three qualities correspond to the three divisions of human action which the political economists point out as concerned with industry, Production, Distribution, and Consumption. The Co-operative Workshop or Industrial Society has, for its social object, to secure *justice in production*—to divide the results of all work done there among those who in any way, by capital, labour, or skill, contribute to produce it, according to what in justice each ought to have; not, as is the case in ordinary workshops, according to what each man's strength of body, of mind, or of position, enables him to snatch for himself. Again, the Co-operative Store or Provident Society, has for its object to secure *justice in distribution and exchange*, not carrying on this important function as society now carries it on, by placing men between the producer and con-
mer, with the maxim "make the most that you can out of both;" "buy
p and sell dear," as their "Golden Rule:" but providing for its being
ed on upon its true basis, as an agency, for the mutual benefit alike, of
producer to whom it will seek to give a just price for what he produces,
of the consumer to whom it will supply these articles at only so much

increase of price as is due to the capital, labour, and skill, required in the transaction (*a*).

'For the third function, that of consumption, or the enjoyment of the things produced, no special provision is made by the arrangements now contemplated. They leave the institutions adapted to promote this object to grow up, as we are satisfied they will grow up, of themselves, so soon as by the practice of justice in production and distribution, wealth becomes more equally diffused among the population, and self-interest less dominant, than is at present the case.

'We believe that it is the absence of any proposals relating to this function of consumption, which, more than anything else, has made many zealous social reformers, look with comparative indifference on the workshops and stores to which Co-operative efforts have appeared to be limited. Their imaginations have been so accustomed to revel amongst the promised delights or advantages of a higher social condition, the gardens, the libraries, the halls, the schools, the pleasant dwellings, the varied occupations of that hoped-for world, that they do not recognize in the sterner working world of Co-operation, in its workshops and stores, the seeds of the very institutions to which they look forward. And yet is it not evident that before we can obtain the enjoyments which wealth secures, we must possess the sources from which wealth springs? And what are these, but those workshops and stores, those means of production and distribution, with which Co-operation busies itself? Have not these been, during the last century, the source of that vast accumulation of wealth in the hands of the manufacturing and trading classes in England, which has raised them to their present importance, and placed half the land of England in their hands? Let the working classes, whose limbs and whose brains are indispensable to all the operations of industry or trade, set themselves in right earnest to form centres of production and distribution for themselves, on those principles by which alone they, as a class, can benefit—the principles of mutual justice; and they may, if they will, change the wealth-producing process, from being one by which a few are made very rich by the labour of many, into one by which the whole body, through their joint exertions, gradually enrich each other. With the possession of wealth will come the means of creating the outward sources of enjoyment of which so much has been said: still more, with the possession of wealth *thus acquired* will come the spirit through which these sources of enjoyment will be able to be enjoyed. At present, if the population of England could be suddenly placed amidst such institutions as social reformers have dreamt of, we believe that they would be unable to keep them in operation. For all these institutions assume the general existence among those who are living under them, of a regard for what is due to others, a spirit of courtesy, a readiness to help each other, a trustful, unselfish disposition, of all which we see, unfortunately, but scanty traces at present, and cannot hope to see more, until we see in the dealings between man and man the general exercise of that virtue of justice, sterner and less attractive, but the indispensable condition of all social good.

'Now the institutions by which justice may be secured in the production and distribution of wealth, the working classes of England have the power to found with an assurance of success, if only they have the *will!* The

---

'(*a*) The Committee do not wish to be considered as intending by these words to cast any particular reproach on tradesmen, whether wholesale or retail, who individually may, in their several spheres, be kind and honourable men. They refer only to the false position in which, from the want of good social arrangements for carrying on the important functions of trade, all traders are necessarily placed. The same remark applies to what has been said about production.'

steps in the process are few and easy to be followed. The first step is to take the supply of their own consumption, the distribution of the articles which they require for their own use, into their own hands, as they may do by means of Co-operative Stores. The second step is to combine these Stores by means of general centres of supply, one of which already exists in London in the Central Co-operative Agency, and thus make themselves important as wholesale buyers. The third step is to use their power of buying, thus organized, in setting up productive institutions, with their proper centres of supply, to make what they want to buy. The fourth step is to institute among these productive institutions a system of exchange of labour, founded upon principles of strict justice. These arrangements will, doubtless, require time for their development, but they are clearly not impracticable. When these have been effected, the institutions, by which the advantages and enjoyments promised by Social Reformers may be attained, will begin to spring up on all sides; the forms of a higher social order of things will make themselves visible resting upon the solid foundation of just dealing, and gradually built up by the spirit of mutual trust and genuine good-will—which the exercise of this humbler virtue will call forth, or foster.

'Let no man then suffer himself to be discouraged when he is engaged in the task, often difficult and wearisome, of setting in motion a Co-operative Store, or a Co-operative Workshop, by the thought that what he is doing costs much exertion and seems to be of little use. Ploughing and harrowing is hard, unpromising work, but let a good seed bed be once prepared, and the good seed sown, in due time the golden harvest will reward the husbandman's toil.

'Sow the good seed of justice, in those great functions of human activity—the production and distribution of the fruits of labour; prepare the good seed bed of institutions in which this seed can be properly nourished: the eternal laws of God's providence will not fail to give you in due time the glorious harvest of a true human society.'—*Report of Co-operative Conference, pp.* 4—6.

The experiment of cooperative association is at least in vigorous and intelligent hands, and its spread will be rapid as soon as some few evident tokens of success appear. But so long as it is antagonistic, so long as it is animated mainly by the proud and rebellious spirit which envies all superiority, it is in a course that may end in mutual collision and self-crushing rivalry. The Church alone possesses the true principle which can give life to a general cooperative union, for she alone has anything to give to him who truly surrenders his own individual pride and selfishness. But from the spiritual nature of her chief functions, she naturally requires some appearance in the world itself of a germ which she may foster. It must be a germ that draws its life from her own principles, and the laws of its organization from her precepts, but it need not be the direct creation of her authority.

Man, on the whole, produces more than he wants, and the problem of distribution can therefore scarcely be impossible. When population increases, man tends strongly still to produce as much as he wants, and in the fullest and most advanced countries he produces more commodities in proportion to his

numbers than he did in savage days. The money that is wasted in *excess* of drink, well applied, would leave few in England short of victuals, and for money the victuals would be forthcoming. Education, if universal, would very much diminish pauperism and distress, but there would still be need of some organization which might direct labour and capital into the most desirable channels, and balance the increase of one service by a proportionate increase of another. A large body thus working within itself might hold its place within the community, and by degrees it is conceivable that the advantages of such combination might draw the whole people into one or more such unions, or into acquiescence in their arrangements of prices, wages and the like. But this is a remote possibility, while it can scarcely be doubted but that a limited society might be formed with advantage on cooperative principles, with rules of mutual insurance, for education, apprenticeship, employment, emigration, settlement, &c. Even our agricultural poor are not so driven to the minimum of subsistence, but that young men might engage in some such combinations with advantage. But artisans and manufacturing workmen, who have higher wages, need only good plans, and prudence to adopt them, in order to secure to themselves and their families almost a certainty of maintaining tolerable prosperity, with a fair chance of further advancement. Meanwhile selfishness and distrust stand even more in men's way than imprudence and impatience, and constantly prevent agreements and combinations which might issue in the greatest mutual advantage. And it must never be forgotten that these evil dispositions cannot be eradicated by the very best social arrangements, as on the other hand it is possible to act under the present system of free competition on the highest principles of charity and mutual accommodation. The same facts produce very different practical impressions on different minds. On coming to the conclusion that wages are determined by the market value of the commodity of labour, one master will conclude that, such being the case, he is to make as good a bargain as he can; another will infer, no less logically, that since the labourer has no protection but in the necessity of some one being found to do the work, it is his duty to see that his own labourer at least is not oppressed in his wages. The received political economy, viewed as a science, has as good a right to the one conclusion as to the other. The only question is, whether, and how far, political economy can aid Christian principle in carrying out its ends. And this is a question not lightly to be given up as irrelevant. The economists of the socialist school, though they believe that they see beyond J. S. Mill with respect to the principle of population, ought not to

forget that he has appreciated and adopted the suggestions of Babbage with respect to co-operative establishments.[1] It is to be regretted that a man so earnest in purpose and so intelligent as M. St. André cannot refrain from using the terms 'Economy' and 'Economist' in a bad sense, and with reference to certain practical conclusions which the best political economists would be glad to dispense with. It is not from inhumanity, but from an intellectual difficulty, that J. S. Mill resorts to improbable suppositions of the future prudence and self-denial of mechanics and labourers. If an extension of the cooperative system will enable them to dispense with a course of action alien to natural and allowable tendencies, so much the better, and Mr. Mill will not be the last to admit it. But they should excuse his caution, and improve upon him without reviling him, or the science to which he has striven to give a right direction.[2] It may not be too much to expect of the lower classes, in an improved state of cultivation, what is now done by the higher, who commonly marry late, or do not marry, if they do not see the way to maintaining a family in their own rank. But when he goes beyond this, he certainly exposes himself to attack, and gives reason to suspect the completeness of his theory. At the same time he has not failed to indicate the direction of the only remedy which can solve the difficulty he has raised. If he has not ventured further, it may be because he perceives what M. St. André states as the result of long experience and many efforts.

'I intended to render available to you and your country, as a token of my gratitude to both, the results of a costly and varied experience protracted during twenty consecutive years. The results of that experience I summed up then, and still sum up as follows:—

1st. That the introduction of the principle of association and valid combination into the industrial and economical life of society as being the proper check against irrational and conflicting competition, and the only means of securing education, labour, and adequate subsistence to all men in their respective local and national circles, to be successfully and effectively carried out, requires a strong discipline, and the entire submission and coordination of the acts and dealings of every private individual and

---

[1] See Mill's Political Economy, b. iv. c. viii. s. 5.

[2] Mr. Ludlow has done justice to Mr. J. S. Mill in his Lectures on the Master Engineers and their Workmen, p. 25:—'If we turn to Mr. J. S. Mill, we find a writer whose whole spirit is so generously devoted to the improvement of the masses, that it is almost impossible to pick out any special passages embodying that feeling. Take, however, the following: "In Europe, the time, if it ever existed, is long past, when a life of privation had the smallest tendency to make men better workmen or more civilised beings. It is, on the contrary, evident, that if the agricultural labourers were better off, they would both work more efficiently, and be better citizens. I ask then, is it true or not, that if their numbers were fewer they would obtain higher wages?" "High wages and short hours," he says elsewhere tersely, "are generally good objects."'

private family as producer and consumer to a common social rule freely accepted and strictly enforced.

2d. That association is essentially a religious principle, the very refraction of spiritual light and love, which is Christianity in the temporal relations of men, and that therefore any attempt to establish co-operation or collective action in the economical functions of society is either consciously or unconsciously a Christian movement, and must fail or succeed in the direct ratio of its being in conformity with true Christian principles, namely, Church principles, and of the amount of Christian faith and self-denial evinced by individuals engaged in a cooperative and socialist effort.' *Letter*, p. 14.

This is plain and important truth, and the sooner it becomes understood by English Socialists, the better; but it is still more necessary that it should be known to all who desire to aid the cooperative efforts of the labourer and the mechanic by counsel or contribution. The calculation and contemplation of all that is involved in the first of these two propositions would at once put out of the question many a visionary scheme, and prove many a specious proposal to be either worthless or of but partial and temporary benefit. And the necessity of submitting to the conditions requisite to give a truly social, and not merely joint-stock, character to combination would silence many a hasty claimant of property or privileges, which he would use, and only thinks of using,if once made his own, as selfishly as the present possessors.

The truth is, that the claims of individual liberty are fatal to almost any scheme that can be hastily drawn up for the combination of different classes. And supposing individuals to surrender their present liberty of action, there are still difficulties in securing the quality of work, which is now maintained in some measure by competition. The necessary organization for such purpose, and the habits of action required for them, must *grow*, and cannot be instantaneously created. And the most favourable chance for the growth of such organization is in a state of peace and order, and good-will between different classes. It would act as a remedy, it is true, for the social war of strikes and lock-outs, counterfeiting and counter-advertising, touting and underselling; but it cannot probably come in as a compromise in that war, it must appear as a mediating party beside the combatants. In order to this, its own character should be as little as possible competitive, its accommodations mutual, its rules elastic, its principles firm, its scope comprehensive of all classes, and its founders far-sighted, patient, and self-denying. M. St. André is probably somewhat premature in expecting Englishmen to be able to submit to the amount of 'discipline' which is necessary for his combinations. Most of them certainly will not do *that* on speculation. They must see their advantage

clearly before they will sacrifice so much of their liberty. But he is right in selecting the functions of consumption as those which are most likely to afford the means of combining classes, and giving an universal character to a cooperative movement. His *ideal* Board of supply and demand, of which his present little establishment is merely a possible germ, is a kind of universal cooperative store, or bank of all commodities. Such an engine, in honest hands, devoted to the cause of cooperation, would control, while it would also effectually encourage, cooperative production, and would make various cooperative societies beneficial to one another. It is unquestionably a good division of labour, and a saving upon the present expensive, speculative, and somewhat demoralizing machinery of selling. But its efficacy for the ends which he purposes depends upon its obtaining extensive support, and becoming a kind of public institution, in the hands of disinterested men, who have deliberately before them the object of a just division of profits in all the processes of production and supply.

Whether or not such a scheme can be carried into effect, there can be no question but that the idea of cooperation has taken root and is likely to spread. And it is, to say the least, a healthier form of speculation than that of communism, or of agrarian agitation. In that direction, if in any, is the escape from the pressures of bankruptcy on the one hand, and starvation on the other, which preserve a rude and fluctuating balance in the unorganized state of commercial and industrial life. And it is not unreasonable to suppose that now the consciousness of those pressures has been developed by political economy, the remedy of them may also be open to the joint reason of large societies, as well as to the individual prudence of capitalists, real or sham, the latter of whom are their most dangerous promoters. And while the collection of documents published by M. St. André may appear to superficial readers a proof that the problem is insoluble, and only involves those who undertake it in endless confusion, a closer study of it will lead to other thoughts. It may be that some who really understand the question will shrink from the difficulty, or will be deterred from undertaking such work by other responsibilities; but it is scarce possible to enter thoroughly into the question without seeing that there is a real work to be done, a real organization possible, and clear principles on which it must be constructed, or rather vitally concreted, in order to give at least an example of social justice and mutual aid and support in all the transactions of life. It is in order to call the attention of Churchmen to the progress of facts and theories in this department, that this subject has been, otherwise prematurely, taken up. There are Commu-

nistic, Pantheistic, and Atheistic heads at work, and the work is one which ought to be done by men of sound and sober faith. And if Mr. E. V. Neale, Mr. Maurice, and Mr. Kingsley, though with better views, have not taken so satisfactory a course as to make it desirable that the movement they have set on foot should continue unmodified, it would be well for able men to investigate the questions and problems which have arisen, and if possible to propose or adopt better methods of working out such kindred objects as may afford some example of a real social reformation.

ART. VII.—*The Problem, 'What is the Church?' solved. Σκέψις περὶ τοῦ τί ἦν εἶναι τῆς Ἐκκλησίας· or, The Counter Theory.* Oxford and London: John Henry Parker. 1853.

WE do not, in general, begin with theory. Facts come first, and theory afterwards, although we can hardly state facts without involving a theory. It would be a curious and interesting task to examine the 'positive philosophy' of this day, and see how much theory is involved in its elementary assumptions; and it would be scarce too bold to say, that as long as we generalize at all, we cannot wholly escape the presupposition of some theory or other. In matters of religion it is certainly impossible. Not only in the description of facts, but in the very apprehension and primary estimation of them, a view or notion comes in which involves the assumption of a principle sufficient to determine and imply an extensive theory. Yet possibly this may be the way in which we were intended to become acquainted with the facts, rather than by first acquiring the knowledge of a theory, and then applying it. We may have been meant to see features, characteristics, indications, first, and by estimating them roughly, and grouping them as we were able, gradually to become aware of a pervading system, and to perceive something like a *rationale* of the spiritual facts which surround us. In this process, our apprehension of facts will be somewhat modified by the gradual development and clearing of our theoretic views, but ought not at any time to be wholly reconstructed upon a theoretic basis.

Dr. Newman's Theory of Development has too much of the latter character, and has, accordingly, proved satisfactory to no very great number of minds. It is not the theory which Romanism had gradually worked out and stereotyped for itself, nor even an improvement upon that theory, but a new foundation, perilous to insert under the cupola of S. Peter's. Still, to us who view the Roman system from without, the substitution might be thought to offer a chance of conviction, enabling obnoxious facts to take a more plausible shape and arrangement, and grounding them on principles which seemed partly at least of iron, though partly also of 'miry clay.' The moral and logical necessity of development formed a strong framework to enclose and hide the unsound foundation of assumed premises, and to hold together the unburnt brickwork of questionable conclusions. The work is a bold and a great effort, the best defence that could be made for a really false step; right in the main if that step was

right, but if not, wrong, and only the more wholly wrong, the more complete in its extent, and the more ingenious in its texture. On the whole, it was the man, and not the book, that carried off a train of converts.

Nevertheless there was a certain impression that something had been said that was a sufficient account of the Roman facts; and people who did not very deeply examine into particulars, could yet accept a general theory of development as offering a convenient solution for all imaginable difficulties. And unsatisfactory as it is to most of us, the whole system certainly did appear to approve itself to some minds, and to afford them satisfaction where they had doubted, and perhaps even conviction where they had questioned or opposed. It was, at least, a theory of what many of us had regarded as wholly irrational and unaccountable, and it must be allowed that a true system must be capable of a theory. This is true, although it is not equally certain that we must be able to discover that theory. So far as it went, Dr. Newman's work was a step towards establishing the point, that some theory at least could be given for Romanism, and thus far it was a step toward giving advantage to Romanism above Anglicanism with those who could find no satisfactory theory of Anglicanism.

The author of 'The Counter Theory' was not, he says, even then, one of those who wanted a theory to oppose to this formidable demonstration. While he admits, however, that some answers of more or less weight have been given, he attributes to them in general a negative character, and desiderates, up to the time of the publication of his own work, a complete and positive statement, which could be placed parallel to the 'Theory of Development,' as the truth which was to supplant and supersede it. As, however, he professes to have only brought out and elaborated the view which was then already clear to his own mind, so he must allow others to remark, that his originality is rather to be found in grouping and in detail than in his main theory. And he may not hereafter be sorry to find, in ancient writers, as well as in modern, somewhat more of his own principles than he has hitherto acknowledged. He writes sometimes almost as if he had had a new revelation, while he is expressing truths which have certainly been revealed to others before him.

Dr. Moberly's preface, and a well-remembered, though hitherto unpublished sermon of Dr. Pusey's on Unity, may be quoted as instances in which positive views have been distinctly brought forward, and that very much in accordance with the present writer's analogies. And, amongst ancient writers, he has hardly done justice to S. Justin Martyr and S. Clement of Alexandria, who both of them hold the leading principles of his general theory of

the history of man. S. Justin clearly acknowledges the extent of the patriarchal dispensation as including the pious heathen, and S. Clement no less clearly acknowledges the Divine Word as the Educator of universal humanity, and sketches out the periods of relative infancy with reference to the maturity of the Gospel, and that of the future estate of the blessed.

'Since, then, we have shown that we all are called children by the Scripture, and not only so, but that we who have followed Christ are allegorically represented as infants, while the Father of all alone is perfect, (for in Him is the Son, and in the Son the Father,) it is time for us, following due order, to declare who is the Guide of our childhood. He is called Jesus. Sometimes He calls himself a Shepherd, and says, "*I am the good Shepherd;*"[1] He who guides us children, being conceived of as the Shepherd in charge of infants, by a metaphor from the shepherds of sheep, since infants are simple, like the sheep who represent them in allegory. "*And they shall be,*" He says, "*all one flock, and there shall be one shepherd.*" The Word, then, is fitly called the Guide of our childhood (Παιδαγωγός), who is guiding us children to salvation. Most plainly, at any rate, the Word said of Himself by Hosea, "*I am your chastener.*"[2] But religion is the guiding of our childhood, being a learning of the service of God, and an instruction toward the knowledge of the truth. And it is a right guiding, as it leads us up to heaven. . . . . .

'But the Guide of our childhood, the Holy and Divine Jesus, the Word, who is the Leader of the whole human race, the Very God who loveth man, it is who guideth us. And the Holy Spirit saith of Him somewhere in the song, "He sustained the people in the wilderness, in the thirst of the burning heat, in the land without water. He encircled him, and instructed him, and kept him as the apple of an eye, as an eagle hovereth over her young ones; and He brooded anxiously over His young ones. He spread His wings and received them, and took them up upon His shoulders. The Lord alone led them, and there was no strange god with them."[3] Clearly, I think, the Scripture indicates the Guide of childhood, by describing His leading. Again, when He speaks in His own person, He confesses Himself the Guide of childhood. "I am the Lord thy God, who led thee out of the land of Egypt."[4] Who, then, hath authority to lead in and out? Is it not the children's Guide? He it was who appeared to Abraham, and said to him, "I am thy God, walk before Me."[5] And him, in most tutorial wise, He prepareth to be a faithful child, saying, "And be thou perfect. And I will put My covenant between Me and thee, and thy seed." Here is the communion of a friendship watching over him. And of Jacob He most evidently appeareth to be the Guide, as of a child; for He saith to him, "Behold I am with thee, keeping thee in all thy way whithersoever thou goest; and I will bring thee back into this land, because I will not forsake thee, till I have done all that I spake unto thee."[6] And with him, also, He is said to wrestle. "Jacob," it says, "was left alone, and there wrestled a Man with him" (the Guide of his childhood) "until the morning."[7] This Man was He that led and carried, who joined in his exercise, and anointed the practised wrestler, Jacob, against the evil one.

'And to show at once that the Word was at once the Trainer for Jacob, and the EDUCATOR OF HUMANITY (Παιδαγωγὸς τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος), "he asked Him, and said unto Him, Tell me Thy name. And He said, Wherefore askest thou after My name?"[8] For He was reserving the new name for

[1] John x. 11, 16. [2] Hosea v. 2. [3] Deut. xxxii. 10, sqq.
[4] Exod. xx. 2. [5] Gen. xvii. 1, 2. [6] Gen. xxviii. 15.
[7] Gen. xxxii. 24. [8] Ib. v. 29.

the new, the infant people. And the Lord God was still without a name, not having yet become man. Nevertheless, "Jacob called the name of that place "The form of God; for I saw God," he said, "face to face, and my life was saved."[1] But the face of God is the Word, by whom God is brought to light and made known. Then also he was named Israel, when he saw the Lord God. This is God, the Word, the Guide of childhood, who said to him again afterward, "Fear not to go down into Egypt."[2] Behold how the Educator accompanies the righteous man, and how He trains the wrestler, teaching him to trip up the heels of the adversary.

'This, at any rate, is the same who also taught Moses to be a guide of childhood; for the Lord saith, "If any man hath sinned before Me, I will blot him out of My book. But now go thou, and lead this people by the way into the place of which I told thee."[3] Here He is teaching him the guiding of children; for the Lord was in truth, through Moses, the Guide of childhood to the ancient people, and by Himself the Leader of the new people, face to face. For "behold," He saith to Moses, "Mine angel goeth before thee," when He set over him the evangelising and leading power of the Word, but reserved the dignity of the Lord; "but in the day that I visit," He saith, "I will bring their sin upon them;" that is, in the day when I shall sit as Judge, I will give them back the due reward of their sins. For one and the same, as Educator and Judge, He judgeth those who have disobeyed Him. But the Word, who loveth man, is not silent as to the sin, but reproveth it, that they may repent. For "the Lord will have the repentance of the sinner, rather than his death."[4] But let us, having learned the sins of others as infants, by way of hearing, for fear of the threat, lest we suffer the like, abstain from the like offences. What, then, was it that they offended? That "in their anger they slew men, and in their rage they hamstrung a bull: cursed is their anger."[5] Who, then, would instruct us with greater kindness?

'First, then, for the elder people, there was the elder covenant; and the law educated the people with fear, and the Word was an angel. But for the fresh and new people, there has been a fresh and new covenant given; and the Word has come into the world, and fear has been turned into love, and that mystical angel Jesus is brought forth. For this one and the same Guide of childhood said then, "Thou shalt fear the Lord God;"[6] but us He exhorted, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God."[7] For this cause also He commandeth us, "Cease from your works"—your old sins; "learn to do well; decline from evil, and do good."[8] "Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity."[9] This is My new covenant, engraven in the old letter. The newness of the Word, then, is not to be made a reproach; but the Lord saith in Jeremiah, "Say not, I am too young. Before I formed thee in the belly, I knew thee; and before thou camest out of the womb, I sanctified thee."[10] That the prophecy may mean allegorically of us, who, before the foundation of the world, were known of God unto faith, but now are infants, because of the recently fulfilled will of God, even as we have been newly born unto calling and salvation. Wherefore also He saith, "I have made thee a prophet unto the nations,"[11] saying that he must prophesy, that they should not think the name of the younger a reproach to those who are called infants.

'But the law is ancient grace, given through Moses by the Word. Wherefore also the Scripture saith, "The law was given through Moses,"[12] not *by* Moses, but *by* the Word, and *through* Moses His servant. Wherefore, also,

[1] Gen. xxxii. 30. [2] Gen. xlvi. 3. [3] Exod. xxxii. 33, 34.
[4] Ezek. xviii. 23, 32. [5] Gen. xlix. 6. [6] Deut. vi. 2.
[7] Matt. xxii. 37. [8] Is. i. 16. [9] Ps. xlv. 7.
[10] Jer. i. 7. [11] Ib. v. 5. [12] John i. 17.

it was but for a season, but the eternal "grace and truth came to be by Jesus Christ." Observe the expressions of the Scripture. Of the law it saith only, "was given;" but the truth, being the grace of the Father, is the eternal work of the Word. And it is no longer said to be given, but to "come to be" by Jesus, "without" Whom "nothing was made."[1] Moses, at any rate, at once giving way prophetically to the Word, the perfect Educator, foretells both the name and the educating, and setteth before the people their Educator, placing in their hands commandments of obedience. "God shall raise up unto you," he saith, "a Prophet like unto me, from among your brethren,"[2] signifying Jesus the Son of Man, because of Jesus the Son of God. For the name of Jesus, proclaimed before in the law, was a foreshadowing of the Lord. He adds, in fact, counselling the people for their good, "Him shall ye hear." And the man that will not hear that Prophet, "him he threateneth." Such is the name he prophesieth to us of the saving Educator. For this cause, prophecy invests Him with a rod,—a rod of instruction, of rule, of authority, that those whom the persuasive Word healeth not, threatening may heal; and those whom threatening healeth not, the rod may heal; and those whom the rod healeth not, the fire consumeth. "A rod," it saith, "shall spring up from the root of Jesse."[3] Observe at once the care, and the wisdom, and the power of the Educator. "Not according to the appearance," it saith, "shall He judge, nor according to the speech shall He convict. But He shall execute judgment for the humble, and shall convict the sinners of the earth."[4] And by David, "In chastising, the Lord chastised me, and delivered me not over unto death." For to be chastised by the Lord, and guided as a child, is escape from death. And by the same prophet He saith, "Thou shalt rule them with a rod of iron."[5] By this, also, the Apostle was moved, when he said in the Epistle to the Corinthians, "What will ye? Shall I come unto you with a rod, or in love, and in the spirit of gentleness?"[6] But, also, "The rod of Thy power,"[7] he saith, by another prophet, "shall the Lord send forth out of Zion;" but this educating "rod" of Thine, "and Thy staff comforted me," saith another. This is the venerable, the comforting, the saving power of the GUIDE OF CHILDHOOD.'[8]—*S. Clement of Alexandria, Pædagogus*, cap. vii. book i.

It is, however, none the worse for the present theory, or 'Counter Theory,' that it is not entirely new. Novelty of matter is the last praise that a divine should desire, although novelty of thought, novelty of arrangement, novelty of conception, is admissible even in divinity, and constitutes a merit of which the work before us has its full share.

A reflecting reader will be able to dispense with preliminaries, even independently of the hints thrown out in the foregoing remarks, and to find in the paragraphs now to be given a *multum in parvo* of the writer's theory:—

'I had cleared the way thus far in the investigation, when occasional glimmerings were succeeded by mid-day brightness, and the grand idea floated before my mind in overpowering brilliancy. I discovered at once

---

[1] John i. 3. [2] Deut. xviii. 15. [3] Is. xi. 1, 3, 4.
[4] Ps. cxviii. 18. [5] Ps. ii. 9. [6] 1 Cor. iv. 21. [7] Ps. cx. 2.
[8] The Word translated 'Educator' and 'Guide of Childhood,' is the same. reference to *childhood* and to *guidance* in the compound word, is too distinct me places to admit of the use of the word 'Educator' throughout.

that the Law and the Gospel were but integral parts of one stupendous system—nothing more nor less than the discipline of the redeemed individual exhibited upon a gigantic scale! Here was the mystical Woman, the great abstract reality, the redeemed creature! All that Plato and Aristotle had dreamt, of the intimate correspondence between the individual and the body politic, was suddenly fulfilled to the life,—here was the Being of a hundred heads and hundred hands, an individual of individuals, a concrete multitude! Every crisis in the annals of the redeemed man was to be traced upon the continuous system, in monster magnitude. Every analogy observable between soul and body was to be seen, magnified a hundred-fold, in the analogy between the Jewish and the Christian economy. Never before was I so fully able to enter into the spirit of the parallel of S. Augustine between the city of God and that of the world. I beheld her, that is the former, as in a panorama, as one Being, emerging from the womb of time, and fulfilling in her onward course towards eternity, a continuous system of instruction and moral discipline that reminded me powerfully of my own. Only instead of a body I beheld a definite people; and instead of a soul, nations and languages innumerable. For Her the march of the world seemed made, and every age appeared adapted to Her time of life. While She was in the flesh, society could not advance; but the world external to Her spake and acted as a child. Arts and sciences delayed their progress till She was sufficiently matured to be able to profit by them. Mythology, polytheism, Sabian and Magian, lent involuntary testimony to the great verities in which She was to be instructed. Antagonism only furthered Her probation and ultimate good. As soon as Her soul was to be disciplined, distinctions between mind and matter arose among the heathen: and by the time that She could make use of them, Gentile philosophy had carefully dissected the different faculties and functions of the intellect. Then She ceased to be represented by a definite people: and forthwith nations outwardly distinct, but linked together by a hidden tie, presented a marvellous *tableau vivant* of Her mental development! Then all that was external to Her, suddenly beamed with thought and intelligence. Inventions of all kinds were multiplied, the hidden laws of nature were laid bare. As Her discipline came to be more and more spiritual, a spiritual philosophy was evolved in these latter days, which has illustrated Her inner life with almost as much truth and faithfulness as if it had been the sole purpose of those who excogitated it, to have worked for Her edification. I said in my heart, Can those marks of design which abound in the world afford greater testimony to the Being of a God, than these phenomena to the fact of His never-failing Providence?

'One step further, and I was enabled to connect these phenomena with the idea that had preceded them in the Divine Mind. Moses, when entrusted with the Jewish ritual, had a special charge given him,—"See that thou make all things according to the pattern shewed to thee in the Mount." That the significance of these words might be attended to the more, great stress is laid upon them in the Epistle to the Hebrews; and by the author of the Book of Wisdom (ix. 8), they are extended to the first temple. The tabernacle or temple, therefore, had its prototype in the heavens: and should the Christian Church have less? Are not three grades clearly distinguished in the Epistle to the Hebrews? "the shadow," "the express image," and "the things themselves." The second was more of a realization than the first: yet the last is a degree removed from the second: there is a resemblance between the first and second, but both are in their degree types of the last. In the Law is shadowed, say the Fathers, what in the Church Militant is realized, what in the Church Triumphant will be perfected! Is it not the same principle that has been already noticed in the

stages of our individual existence: in the analogy between our outer and our inner man, between our present and our future selves? . . . .

'I could not help looking off from the picture of the Church of Christ thus suggested to that of the Pattern-Man, and observing the close harmony that subsisted between them. Christ the mystical Man, His Church the mystical Woman: His probation accomplished in a single life, Hers accomplished in the successive generations of her members. He, the second Person of the ever-blessed Trinity, assuming our nature without ceasing to be the one Person that He was before: His Church, a rational congregation of independent agents, admitted into fellowship with Divinity: yet, as in His case, without addition to Her Personality. He remaining one Divine Person, while veiled under our common nature: and we the redeemed amongst mankind, clothed upon with His Nature, but without losing our individualism. He the Unity, we the Plurality: His a Divine Manhood, ours a created Godhead!'—Pp. 36—40.

He goes on to trace the different stages of the life of the Church as compared with that of the redeemed individual. The antediluvian life is represented by, or represents, the unregenerate state, as in the magnificent sonnet in the *Lyra Apostolica*:—

'We are not children of a guilty sire,
Since Noe stepp'd from out his wave-toss'd home,
And a stern baptism flush'd earth's faded bloom.
Not that the heavens then clear'd, or cherub's fire
From Eden's portal did at once retire;
But thoughts were stirred of Him who was to come,
Whose rainbow hues so streak'd the o'ershadowing gloom,
That faith could e'en that desolate scene admire.
The Lord has come and gone; and now we wait
The second substance of the deluge type,
When our slight ark shall cross a molten surge;
So, while the gross earth melts, for judgment ripe,
Ne'er with its haughty turrets to emerge,
We shall mount up to Eden's long-lost gate.'—No. cii. δ.

But after regeneration, there are two great processes through which salvation is to be wrought out; the outward and the inward education and discipline of the spiritual man, or, as we must say in the collective view, of the spiritual woman, the spiritual Eve, the Bride of the Second Adam:—

'To apply the foregoing remarks: Eve was now about to be placed under a schoolmaster for the first, or more elementary part of her education, in which state she was to be represented by a peculiar people, living under a special Economy. The like process was to be repeated when the time came for her to be placed under a system of mental or spiritual discipline: only that instead of being confined to one people, it would be a Dispensation extending over all nations: and instead of being circumscribed by a single locality, it would be one that would reach to the uttermost parts of the earth. Finiteness was a congenial idea to the one, as appertaining to the body: infinity to the other, as appertaining to the mind. For the rest, let facts tell their own tale.

'The circumstances attending the promulgation of the Law and that of the Gospel have been often drawn into parallel. Moses and Christ act the

part of the lawgivers on their two respective mountains, the one having confronted and battled Pharaoh, the other Satan. The resemblance between Aaron the mouth-piece of Moses, in the first instance, and S. John the forerunner of our Lord,—between baptism in the Red Sea and baptism in the Jordan, should likewise have been pointed out. The correspondence between the law delivered upon Sinai and that delivered upon Tabor or Beatitudes is self-evident. For it is the same law in either case, but stress was laid upon the letter first, and afterwards upon the spirit. The ceremonial of the Law and that of the Gospel have been frequently compared, though it has been too generally assumed that whatever was fulfilled by Christ ceased with Him. For there is a species of sacrifice that is commemorative, or retrospective, as well as one that looks forward. There is a sacrifice, likewise, that is spiritual, as well as one that is carnal.

'The feast of the Passover is as much perpetuated in the Christian Eucharist as the Ordinance of Circumcision is in the Sacrament of the Font. And prayer and praise, penance and the rending of the heart, have succeeded to wave-offerings and heave-offerings: to the ordinance of the leper, and rending of the garments. The true difference that exists between them is, that one class appeal to the senses or the outward man, the other have to do with the inner man of the heart.'—Pp. 48, 49.

Thus far many have been led in thought, with more or less consciousness, by the obvious analogies which pervade the whole structure of Holy Scripture. But it is one thing to acknowledge that an analogy is traceable, or even that it is intended, and another thing to hold that it is the principal medium through which the Divine dealings with man are to be viewed, and that it is strong enough to imply a general identity of principles and consequent correspondence of particulars. We must allow, however, that it is more consistent with an entire reverence for Holy Writ, as the word of God, to take S. Paul's reasoning about Sarah and Hagar as no mere illustration, but a real argument. And many will remember the impression that was produced on some minds, when it began to be felt that Mr. Newman no longer held exactly to the ground once taken:—

'O rail not at our brethren of the North,
Albeit Samaria finds her likeness there;
A self-form'd priesthood, and the Church cast forth
To the chill mountain air.

'What though their fathers sinn'd, and lost the grace
Which seals the holy Apostolic line?
Christ's love o'erflows the bounds His prophets trace,
In His reveal'd design.

'Israel had seers; to them the Word is nigh;
Shall not that Word run forth, and gladness give
To many a Shunamite, till in His eye
The full seven thousand live?'—No. cvi. 8.

When it was felt that Mr. Newman no longer thought thus only of Presbyterian Scotland, but held Episcopal England to be probably at least involved in a schism like that of Jeroboam, the force of the analogy came home to many minds with a

painful shock, to many with a chilling damp of discouragement. And the feeling was not merely that his judgment was taking a turn unfavourable to the English Communion, but that he had with him an argument of some force, a principle of some importance, which, if he were not greatly mistaken, would bear hard upon the Church he had hitherto defended. It is, on the whole, a favourable symptom of the working of our scriptural education, that we have a sense of such arguments, and attribute no small weight to them, although any reflecting mind must see the danger which they involve of hasty and irrelevant conclusions. The countenance given to them by Holy Scripture is quite sufficient to encourage us in striving to investigate them, and to warrant us in expecting from them some really practical results. The nature of the case, however, demands caution, and a most deliberate procedure; for the knowledge of Holy Writ must be very deep and complete, and the knowledge of history far from superficial, which would warrant a decision upon such grounds, against a balance of direct evidence of other kinds. The very extravagancies of the Puritans are a witness to the power of such views to confirm the judgment and edify the heart; but they show, at the same time, how much care is needed in following them out into action. And the scriptural examples, while they assure us of the importance of the principle of analogy, show at the same time that the correspondence of type and antitype must not be expected to be always exact, and that, consequently, we cannot argue from the one to the other with absolutely conclusive inference. In one of the most important of the Scripture parallels, S. Paul has said, 'But not as the offence, so also *is* the free gift. For if through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, *which is* by one Man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many. And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift: for the judgment was by one to condemnation, but the free gift is of many offences unto justification.' (Rom. v. 15.) A difficult passage, indeed, but one which certainly seems to assert a difference between the ways in which the guilt of the first, and the righteousness of the Second Adam extend to mankind, there being nothing in the former case to correspond to the 'many offences' which are covered by pardoning grace in the latter. The fact is, that an argument to be good must be founded, not upon the mere correspondence of particulars, but upon the general principles indicated in the one case, and repeated in the other.

In order, then, to derive some profit from a work like that hich is now before us, it is by no means necessary to assume iat the analogies which it professes to trace will be perfect.

Rather, if we wish at once to preserve our own independence of judgment, and at the same time to give fair play to a diligent, ingenious, and pious author, we ought to read with a view to see whether the principles of certain cases in the Old Testament history may not be rightly applied by him to certain cases in the history of the Church of the New Testament. If we find any such that were before unknown to us, the perusal will have been a gain, whatever may be our final opinion as to the systematic truth of the whole work. And the present work is especially valuable, in that it gives occasion to the ordinary English reader to shift his point of view from a spot which certainly commands but a very imperfect projection of the general relations of things, spiritual and temporal, in the kingdom of Christ. The trenches of siege operations against Rome, as the spiritual Babylon, are certainly not the point from which the largest prospect is presented to the eye. Be the opinion right or wrong which prompts such measures of attack, there may still be other relations of things beyond those which are involved in that particular controversy, and which will be better seen by a more general survey of the Church and of the world, with the aid of the sacred records.

We have already seen that the author of the 'Counter Theory' feels himself at liberty to contemplate even the visible Church as something more than a visible organisation and polity. The regenerate *race* may doubtless be compared with the children of Israel, independently of the form of government under which they live. And it is possible that in the one case, as well as in the other, it may have pleased God not only to permit irregularities, but to give them a kind of secondary Divine sanction. The kingdom of Jehu, and the altar of Carmel, were Divine remedial measures for the apostasy of the house of Omri. And there may be movements of the Holy Spirit amongst those who are alienated from the polity of the Church, reviving the spiritual life, and restoring a certain measure of truth among them, without yet bringing them back to the more perfect way of those who have never strayed from the fold. It is difficult, for instance, to deny such a character to the moral and spiritual part of Wesleyanism, and to the devotional part of Irvingism, and its character of faith, and love of sound discipline. Assuming, then, that it *may* be true that the Church can be traced, as a race, beyond even her own divinely appointed polity, it is worth while to see whether such a work as that which we are now considering brings forward any certain or probable instances of analogy, in which we can discern principles applicable to Gospel times in the older sacred history. The importance of the subject is such, that it is worth while to

press upon the thoughtful reader the duty of not carelessly turning off an instance of analogy as inapplicable, because it does not fall in with his previous views, or seems to him to involve disagreeable consequences. It is worth while to follow out the course of analogy as traced in a well-considered and thorough-going work, if it were only to extend and re-arrange our own thoughts, and to practise ourselves in the discernment of consequences in this kind of argument. In spite of a good deal of superficial carelessness, both in writing and printing, the book is not a careless one. It is not less diligently thought out than boldly conceived, and its bearings are well balanced throughout.

There is the more reason for a thoughtful perusal where some prominent points are at variance with commonly received notions. We are apt to set down an unexpected supposition as one that 'will not do,' on account of a difficulty. But difficulties and seeming inconsistencies there will be in truth itself. Previously to the knowledge of the facts, it was a real difficulty that Christ was to be at once the Son and Lord of David; or that the Saviour of the world was to be rejected by the Jews, whilst salvation was yet of the Jews. Or, again, we pass on almost without reflection, when we meet with an analogy which we conceive to be at all fanciful, when perhaps the only reason why it appears so to us is that we do not know how to place it. The safest way, perhaps, of dealing with a work like the present is to read it first with a view to ascertain whether it traces any real resemblances of principle, and then again to see whether it succeeds in combining its partial analogies into a tolerably harmonious whole. We cannot, indeed, affirm *a priori* that this combination is a condition of truth; for, although truth is always harmonious, and always in some way systematic, it is yet quite possible that a writer may be in possession of many of the single elements, without having the true key to the system which unites them. But when the claim of system is made, it is necessary both to inquire into its general truth, and also to exercise judgment on the several parts; for a plausible system, too hastily received, may very easily induce us to admit falsehoods in detail.

If it were simply to be stated, that the Popedom is considered to be represented by the kingdom of the house of David, and the Reformation by the Babylonish captivity, it might be assumed that the book was of a decidedly Romanising character. Yet this is by no means the case; nor does it even exclude the possible final identification of Rome with the mystical Babylon. It would be wrong to throw out such anticipations of the writer's views, without a protest that they are

entirely misleading to a student of the popular anti-Babylonish literature. We find here no mere one-sided discussion of a single point, but a thorough and deliberate tracing of parallel principles in the Divine education of man through the Law and through the Gospel:—

'And this brings me to a further remark arising out of the nature of the two Dispensations themselves. The Law, as it has been before said, represents a discipline of the flesh: the Gospel one of the spirit. How much longer are we employed in attending to the development of our minds, than that of our bodies! and for every member of the body, how manifold are the corresponding members or faculties of the soul! Naturally, therefore, the period under the Law is considerably shorter than that of the Gospel: and for every catastrophe under the Law we should expect a hundred of the same kind, or at least one much more portentous or of longer continuance under the Gospel. Then, again, the superior excellence of the New Covenant is to be taken into account, analogous to that of the soul compared with the body: also that the actors in both were partly swayed by their own wills in what they did: also that we have a much more complete history preserved to us of the fortunes of the Church than of the Synagogue.

'From these and other obvious considerations which might have been added, it will be seen that we ought to proceed here, as in chemistry and natural philosophy, by cautious analysis: not trusting to arbitrary canons of our own invention, or seeking to lay down rules before we have satisfied ourselves that they exist in fact; but rather striving to enter into the spirit of the phenomena themselves as we note them down: not presupposing analogies where they do not appear on the surface, or again rejecting them because they do not exactly correspond with our own preconceived notions: but letting those facts which are eloquent tell their own tale artlessly, without, on the other hand, imputing to those which are mute a language and a meaning which does not belong to them. Thus, we may find it to be a fact amongst others, that the characters of prophet, priest, and king, were separated for the most part under the Law, but, once united in Christ, they are found combined in His Church. We may find that events will compare with events in the fullest sense; but that it would be trifling to attempt to draw individuals into parallelism; carnal wars and adversaries under the Law will have spiritual wars and adversaries, pre-eminently, to answer to them under the Gospel; a carnal monarchy will be found to have typified a pre-eminently spiritual one. Much that is seen in the germ here will be exhibited full-blown there: much that is gross and rude in the one, will assume a more rational and polished form in the other. Events will follow each other more rapidly in the shorter dispensation: epochs will be condensed into fewer years. Yet in spite of all discrepancies harmony will peep out where it is least expected: and we shall often be compelled to admit that the difference is merely that of the miniature and the full-length portrait.

'Another observation is, that we should be careful not to confound the ceremonial part of the law with the historical, the esoteric with the exoteric, or the converse. Both, of course, are to a certain extent historical, in so far as the ceremonial had a certain historical development. But the distinction intended to be drawn here is, that all that is ceremonial is to be regarded as appertaining strictly to the concerns of the Sanctuary, and is not for a moment to be confounded with the external polity, whether of Israel and Judah, or of the Church of Christ.

'Once more, it is even still more important that the kingdoms of Jehovah should be kept distinct from the kingdoms of the world: the Economy of

Revelation from that of Nature. It is the external regimen of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah, and no other, that is to be drawn into parallelism with the external regimen of the Christian Church: just as it is the ceremonial part of the Law, and not gentile superstitions, that prefigured Christ and Christian Sacraments. Kings of the earth, and all that belongs to them as such, whether Christian or not, are related to the Church only in the same way that the kings of Egypt and of Edom, of Greece and Persia, were to the Jewish people. Their office is prior to Revelation, and derived its authority from Nature: they guard natural justice, but are not dispensers of the Word and Sacraments. It is the Church as such, therefore, and nothing extraneous to her, that is to be compared with the annals of Israel and Judah. We have no more reason to mix up temporal annals, and dynasties, and politics with ecclesiastical, than we have to mix up Assyrian or Babylonian affairs with those of the Twelve Tribes, except as indirectly affecting them. Phenomena which have occurred in the world may be taken as a witness, illustration, or antithesis of phenomena corresponding to them in the annals of the Law and the Gospel, but not as a type. Ancient politics and heathenism may have their counterparts in modern days, but they are not to be looked for in the Church. Corruptions in the Church, no less than ordinances of a ceremonial or ecclesiastical nature, are to be seen, alas! prefigured in those of the Synagogue—and would that a more perfect Dispensation did not exhibit more flagrant and more extensive backslidings! It is like what Aristotle says of the different forms of government, that the perversion of the best form is the worst!'—Pp. 58—61.

It may be seen from this extract, that the kingdom of the house of David takes its place as a historical fact, without any such universal law of the dispensation as to make it binding in all ages upon all. And in tracing in like manner the history of the Popedom, it will be seen that much of its greatness was the natural and even necessary result of Divine arrangements; and that it exhibited very remarkably some of the predicted triumphs of the Church. It may be found, in like manner, that its course is very closely interwoven with the most extreme and undoubted corruptions; and that its loss of power is the consequence of them, as in the latter days of the dynasty of Judah. The captivity itself is half a judgment and half a blessing, for it is a purifying judgment; and those who are carried away, not those who remain in the land, are the most highly favoured portion of the chosen race. It is they who are the restorers of the law and the rebuilders of the temple.

In fact, the main points of this analogy were discovered and felt long before this book was written, though we are not aware that they were anywhere systematically drawn out. When the Bishop of New Zealand preached his farewell sermon in Exeter Cathedral, on the text, 'By the waters of Babylon we sat down and wept, when we remembered thee, O Sion,' there were those who felt, and said, that though it was true he could remember Sion here, yet it was *we* that were in *Babylon*. And who has not felt, in the restoration of Churches, Church rules, Church services, and Church synods, the spirit of Nehe-

miah hovering over him, and whispering in his ear, 'The God of heaven, He will prosper us; therefore, we His servants will arise and build;'[1] yea, though there were sneering Sanballats around, who 'laughed us to scorn and despised us, and said, What is this thing that ye do? Will ye rebel against the Queen?' The single analogy, in short, is in itself true, and has a real existence; but whether it is systematically and relatively true is a further and deeper question, which the judicious reader must endeavour to solve for himself.

It is, however, justly remarked, that the subjection of the Church of God to a worldly power is not as yet strictly exemplified in the Roman Church, however it may be in future, in case that Church should become the seat of a temporal anti-Christian sovereignty. It is true that the powers to which the Church became subject, in England and other parts of Europe, were not in open defiance of God. But neither was the Babylonish empire always opposed to true religion. On the contrary, during the captivity, we find the witness of God's truth sometimes proceeding from the mouth of heathen kings, and carried through a hundred provinces by their royal messengers. The essential point was, or may at least have been, the subjection of the ecclesiastical to a purely temporal power,—of the chosen people to a government which had not its origin within themselves. And this subjection became, through God's providence, a means of purification, especially from the sin of idolatry, of which we hear nothing after that time.

The previous history has not been left untouched, and the early Christian heretics are compared to the nations of kindred race with Israel, and bordering on the Promised Land, while Gentile philosophy is considered as parallel to the remnants of the Canaanite tribes. The division of East and West is made analogous to the separation of the ten tribes, and the encroachments of Mahometanism to those of the Assyrian empire, from which God rescued the West by the arms of Charles Martel, as he had rescued Judah by the destruction of the host of Senacherib. Perhaps one of the most novel and striking portions of the book, however, consists of the parallel of the history of the kingdom of Judah with that of Western Christendom, and especially of the prophets who warned and reproved the chosen people, with the preachers and writers who witnessed against the abuses of the Mediæval Church. It is an obvious objection, that the one were inspired and the other not. But, if it has pleased God to make the ordinary operation of His Spirit sufficient for the general carrying on of the Gospel, or specially spiritual

[1] Nehem. ii. 19, 20.

dispensation, this is no reason why these persons may not have been the nearest representatives of the ancient prophets in their day. And, certainly, their protests and denunciations are very similar. Many of them are undoubted Catholics, and men whose works almost all would acknowledge to bear witness to a working of the Holy Spirit. S. Bernard, at least, would be allowed, whether by Catholics or Protestants, to have spoken with a Divine unction, and with no small share of sacred wisdom; and yet few have more boldly denounced the moral corruption of their times, or charged it more openly upon the hierarchy. And men of even questionable orthodoxy may have been moved from above with zeal against manifest abuses; for the Spirit which incites to great actions does not always guide men in every particular. Gideon was moved by the Spirit, yet his ephod became a snare to the people. Saul was moved by the Spirit, and yet fell into disobedience. The man of God that came from Judah was misled into communion with the idolaters of Bethel. Balaam spoke by the Spirit, and yet acted as the very instrument of Satan for the temptation of Israel. But we need not limit the prophets of the Mediæval Church to the powerful declaimers against abuses. There were men who rather aimed at drawing the soul to God, and warning against sin in its more hidden forms, whose works might well be reckoned amongst the gifts of God to His Church, though they have not been invested with any superhuman authority. When they are placed parallel with prophets in a scheme of analogy, it need not be meant that they were literally prophets, or actually inspired in the like degree, but simply that they filled the same place in the new dispensation, so far as it pleased God that it should be filled at all. As for the development of doctrine which took place in the prophetic times, it is remarked that it was not formally systematised and sanctioned; and a parallel is drawn between the Jewish and Christian Churches in this respect, tending to show that we may reasonably expect development without precise definition.

The practically important point, and that in which this theory differs most from Dr. Newman's Theory of Development, is, that the irregularities and disorders of the new and spiritual dispensation have been not inferior in number and in magnitude to those of the old and carnal system. And the place assigned to the present times, and to the Churches of the Anglican Communion and other reformed bodies, is also different, and such as clearly to warrant the continuance of true Catholics in every duly constituted Christian society. The Divine appointment of the Popedom is held to be providential and secondary, not economical and essential. And the restora-

tion which is obligatory in conscience upon all who learn the true requirements of the Christian covenant, is not that of the monarchy but of the temple,—not of the alterable, external government, but of the essential and absolutely divine ordinances, and of the revealed doctrines and prescribed practices, and, above all, of inward life and love.

'Analogy would suggest that any revival under the Gospel answering to the Return from Captivity should be a spiritual and not a local one; of moral influence, rather than of outward show in the flesh. The case is plainly not so with mercies as with chastisements of the Almighty. Temporal judgments and spiritual rewards go together under the Gospel, though of course it for the most part happens that a withdrawal of Divine grace is made concurrent with outward visitations. The Great Rebellion and the French Revolution of the last century caused the mind of society to suffer immensely, and morals and religion felt the scourge almost as much as the outward man; still, clearly those points in the visitation which the world would account most terrible, would be those which affected life and property. The return of grace, on the other hand, would operate upon the mind of the Church, in the faith and practice of her living individual members in the first instance: and outward effects would only follow, in proportion to the removal of outward as well as inward impediments.

'Again, analogy would suggest that any revival to be genuine would be a Restoration of the Temple, and not of the Kingdom, not the work of a moment, but interrupted by intervals, and alternate with judgments; a work commencing from the very foundations, and only completed in the entire re-construction of the whole edifice. Such, at all events, was the return of Judah from Babylon: it was a long and arduous process, and in which

'"Every one that builded, with one of his hands wrought in the work, and with the other held a weapon."

Finally, when the work was completed, what reflections does it suggest? Are we not called upon to remember how far the glory of the Second Temple fell short of that of the First, the tears of the ancients, as well as the shoutings, that accompanied the laying of the first foundations under Zerubbabel? Or can it be too strongly or too seriously impressed upon our minds, that the moral of the type is clearly not to expect too great things in the antitype? What is it that the ark of the covenant, Urim and Thummim, the Shekinah, the holy fire, all hopelessly lost and irrecoverable, typify?'—Pp. 210, 211.

The present period is, of course, the most difficult to analyze with certainty, because we see facts only in their present appearance and past history, and not at all in their future results. Even what took place in the last century has had time to bear some fruits. What is taking place at the present time must be judged simply by what we know of it in a manner *a priori*. It is not, therefore, to be expected that we should be able to assign the exact analogy of everything that is now passing, and the very attempt might well cause some prejudice against the rashness of any one who should venture on it. Still, where a principle can be clearly discerned, we may use an imperfectly ascertained analogy as of some value in itself, though

not yet a sure and authoritative type. How far it is wise to deal with the uncertain in theology, how far to throw out conjectures, and publicly propound views in which the author may after all be mistaken; is a very serious question, and one which is forced upon the mind by a book which is in great part even professedly conjectural. But the degree of conjecture is of two kinds. In the field of mere conjecture, where we know that no one can know anything, the danger lies chiefly in its occupying the mind, drawing it off from ruled and certain truth, and amusing it rather than instructing. In the field of real theology, and its confines, the danger is of a more critical character, since a conjecture on some neighbouring point may very readily warp the judgment with respect to an article of faith, and lead us to curtail, distort, or disbelieve it. There is an enthusiasm of research about the author of the 'Counter Theory,' which makes it needful both for himself and his readers to be put on their guard, to hold all private speculation in abeyance in the presence of ecclesiastical authority.

There is, perhaps, a little too much boldness in throwing out statements and conjectures in the final dissertations in this volume. The object of the first is to question whether the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist may not be administered even by a layman, so far as mere possibility is concerned. The admission that it may is reconciled with the contrary view of the Church by the consideration, that the Church having forbidden any other than the priest to consecrate, a layman cannot consecrate without sin, and consequently neither he nor his abettors can partake worthily. The consequence of this would be, that none knowingly receiving thus, when they ought to communicate with the priest, can obtain the *benefit* of the sacrament. It is important to observe, that no such view authorizes any person to continue knowingly in schism or irregularity. We are not, however, under the necessity of going so far as to allow any validity to lay administration of the Eucharist, in order to be charitable to erring brethren, or to hope well for them; and perhaps a suspended judgment, while we take ourselves the undoubtedly safe course, is the nearest to truth.

The second dissertation is on a subject which the enthusiasm of some sects and of some individuals in our day makes practical to many,—the supposed future Millennium. A conjecture has recently been made, not without some support from antiquity, that the middle ages were, in fact, that period; but this writer takes an earlier commencement, and one more consistent with his strictly spiritual view of the kingdom of Christ.

'This is in fact the rest which Elijah, and which Enoch still more, have been enjoying ever since their respective translations: and this is the rest which,

ever since the ascension of the Man Christ Jesus into heaven, patriarchs and prophets, Apostles and martyrs, have been enjoying in His presence, contemporaneously with the development of the Church Militant upon earth. Since the incarnation, or rather, the reconciliation upon the cross, I say "*the being with Christ*" has been, what one may call, an accessory idea in the mind of Inspiration to the state of rest typified in the sabbath or seventh day, perhaps, indeed, the more prominent one; S. Paul says,

'"I am in a strait betwixt two: having a desire to depart and *to be with Christ*, which is far better: nevertheless, to abide in the flesh is more needful for you." . . . .

'The unavoidable inference is, that when he *did* depart out of the flesh, put off his earthly tabernacle, he came to be "with Christ."

'"Lord, remember me when Thou comest into Thy kingdom!" said the penitent thief. The answer of our Lord is as emphatic as it is conclusive:—

'"*Verily*, I say unto thee, *to-day* thou shalt be with Me in paradise." . . . 'It is presumed that nothing which was assured to S. Paul and the penitent thief, has not been shared, in kind at all events, by the whole company of the faithful upon ceasing to exist in the body.

'Thus much admitted, the next inference would seem equally necessary: the "being with Christ" implies a true local existence in His spiritual kingdom. Christ, in the integrity of His Human nature, it has been often argued, exists of necessity in some definite spot or place; so that where He is, there is His kingdom: and where His kingdom is, there is He. What the characteristics of His kingdom are, we may further gather from Scripture. First, it is the kingdom that formed the burden of His preaching during His earthly ministry—

'"Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand."

Secondly, it is the kingdom into which He entered upon His Ascension—

'"Wherefore God also *hath* highly exalted Him, and given Him a Name which is above every name, that at the Name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth: and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ *is* Lord, to the glory of God the Father."

'Thirdly, it is a kingdom, in the strict sense of the word, as well in heaven as upon earth. It is acknowledged on all hands that the phrase, "Kingdom of Heaven," throughout Scripture, is continually equivalent to the Dispensation of the Gospel, or, in other words, the Church Militant upon earth; but who would think of asserting that one styled emphatically the *Kingdom of Heaven* should not exist *there* still more perfectly than it exists *here:* who would assert that those who "depart," and are "with Christ," as the Apostle says, are excluded from actual membership in His kingdom, as soon as they quit earth?'—Pp. 250—252.

There are two points which are thrown into the shade in the ordinary views of the Millennium, but which ought to be considered before such opinions as are here suggested are thrown aside as *prima facie* inadmissible. One is, that Christ's kingdom upon earth is, in truth, what it is to those who truly receive it, an inestimably blessed and glorious thing. The life of saints on earth is an anticipation of glory itself, though in the midst of difficulties and dangers. Its inner and central essence is a rest in God, of which the blessedness is beyond expression; and its

outward deeds, though mixed with sin and wrought in weakness, are yet spiritually like the battles of Jonathan and of David. The other point is, that the present invisible kingdom of Christ is not excluded from the signification of millennial prophecy by any express terms, nor have we any the least authority for separating His reign over the saints in the state of rest, from His reign over the kingdoms of the world as they have been His in Christendom, so as to exclude the one from bearing any relation to the other. The only difficulty in the application of the prophecies to these times lies in the imperfection of their fulfilment in the visible completeness of the kingdom of Christ. But that argument has been repeatedly answered by the analogy of the prophecies of the elder dispensation, and the drawbacks occasioned by man's unfaithfulness in the brightest times of the Hebrew monarchy. Even this answer is not half understood, without deep reflection on the Law, and what it was to the ancient people; as well as on the Gospel, and what it is to those who heartily receive and live by it. The chiefest glories of Christ's kingdom are not in the high places of the earth.

The remaining dissertation is on the true analogy of the spiritual Eve, and is especially directed against the Roman practice of making everything in Holy Scripture that bears upon that analogy centre individually in the blessed Virgin, and not in the corporate unity of the Holy Catholic Church, the true Bride of Christ, the second Adam.

'Figure Eve of the Church, and all is natural: figure her of the Blessed Virgin, and there is not a single relationship, human or divine, that is not perverted. She who was mother of our Lord is put forward in the character of His spouse: she who was wife of Joseph is put forward in the character of his mother. Meanwhile, too, the mystical woman has been altogether forgotten in the individual.

'The next instance will show still more how deeply this heterodox interpretation has been engrained even in daily practice. Cornelius à Lapide has commented upon the Song of Songs, as well as upon Genesis; and here his method of interpretation is:

'"First sense, and that adequate, relating to Christ and the Church; second and partial one, relating to Christ and the devout soul; third and *principal* one, relating to Christ and the Blessed Virgin."

'Hence it is that in the Rosaries, Litanies, and other exercises of devotion, as they are called, to the Blessed Virgin, there is not a single epithet, or image, or figure, by which the Church is designated throughout the said allegorical hymn, that is not primarily and in its strict literal sense, by a most extraordinary distortion, attributed to S. Mary. The most ardent expressions of love, rapture, ecstacy, that language can embody to describe the mutual feelings of man and wife, one towards the other, are represented as there interchanged between our Blessed Lord and His mother according to the flesh! Compare these with *His own* words to her during His whole manifestation in the flesh: and with our ideas of relationships, and of the feelings and expressions of feeling that are due to each one respectively! One might ask the commentator by the way, where are his

ancient authorities for his third and *principal* sense? He found no lack of them for the first and even the second, of which his third is indeed, after all, only a particular instance.

'Once more, the same fatal perversion is to be seen in a book, where it is difficult to apply the most correct canons of interpretation aright, and therefore to perplex the subject with a false one is doubly portentous! I mean the Apocalypse. Here indeed Cornelius sees how utterly futile it would be to trifle with Scripture: and therefore lays more stress on the obvious antitype; yet not only does he not abandon what he had designated throughout the Song of Songs as the principal sense, but he will still call it "the original," and "as it were fundamental" one. And even his worst distortions are left a long way behind in the following passage of a dogmatic treatise, where they form the ground-work of what is adduced as a solid argument in favour of the practice thereby engendered. Dr. Newman, I say, thinks he has hit upon a conclusive argument for the popular prerogatives of S. Mary, where he says:

'"Thus there was 'a wonder in heaven:' a throne was seen far above all created powers; mediatorial, intercessory: a title archetypal: a crown bright as the morning-star: a glory issuing from the eternal throne: robes pure as the heaven, a sceptre over all; and who was the predestined heir of that majesty, who was that wisdom, and what was her name, 'the mother of fair love, and fear, and holy hope:' 'exalted in Engaddi, and a rose-plant in Jericho:' 'created from the beginning, before the world,' in God's counsels: and 'in Jerusalem was her power.' The vision is found in the Apocalypse, a woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars." . . . .

'Even the woman in the Apocalypse is interpreted *literally* to be S. Mary!

'Thus while Christendom has been engaged in developing the glories of a single saint, and adding new festivals in honour of her birth, assumption, and immaculate conception, the true nature of the Mystical Woman has remained a dead letter and unexplored. The daughter has usurped the prerogatives of the mother, the individual stepped into the place of the ideal! I do not assert that it is a perversion of Scripture *exactly* parallel to that of the Jews respecting Messiah and His kingdom: but *it is so antithetically*. The error of the Jews related to the Mystical Man: this to the Mystical Woman; the characteristic of the One has been His unity: of the other her plurality. To multiply the one, or to individualize the other, therefore, is to depart from orthodoxy—and so it has happened. The error of the Jews ended in the conceit of a double Messiah: while Christians, it would appear, by attributing to a single individual those prerogatives which appertain to the whole Mystical Body, have fallen into very carnal, earthly conceits respecting the nature of the true Church. Will it not be a very different theory in which the faithful few have to "wrap themselves round" some time hence, the time of which it is said,

'"When the Son of Man cometh, shall He find faith on the earth?"' . . .
—Pp. 267—270.

The parallel drawn between this perversion of Holy Scripture and the Jewish expectations of a temporal kingdom is curious, and should not be adopted without some consideration. The analogy is not altogether obvious, nor is it complete when pointed out and perceived. There is, however, reason and good sense, and no want of sound divinity, in the criticism of the Roman interpretations. They do belong to the later ages, and

they do interfere with important and unquestionable interpretations relating to the Holy Catholic Church. It is well when such points are urged, as in this instance, with reverence and tenderness toward the due honour which all mankind owe to her who was chosen to be the means of bringing the Son of God into the world.

Taking this work upon the whole, it is worth an attentive perusal; and many who would at first sight scarcely think it worth glancing over, might, if they once gave it fair attention, be glad to give some parts a second reading. It ranges much, certainly, in the ground of opinion, and may for that reason be less valued by those whose main object is dogmatic theology. But there are many questions of interpretation on which it is calculated to throw light, and with respect to which it is not easy, in these days, to avoid taking up some opinion or other. Even if the judgment is held in abeyance, it is most convenient, and often most healthy for the mind, to have a provisional hypothesis, on which we may rest our thoughts when they touch on the particular ground in question. If there is any point, however, on which this writer requires a *caute legendum*, it is his tendency to conjecture, and the enthusiasm with which he groups facts and theories round any central hypothesis. It would take three or four times' reading to disentangle the theology of the book entirely from the hypotheses, and to separate the unquestionable groundwork from the conjectural superstructure. Such is the very nature of a theory; and a book which professes to be a theory is not to be judged by the same standard as a treatise on the Creed. But, in recommending such a book for perusal, the less experienced reader claims of us the warning that, however well thought out it may be, theory is not theology. It may be based on true theology, and may be made the vehicle of true theology; but theology it is not in itself, so far as it is strictly theory.

One great use, however, of such speculative works, is to exercise our minds in this very distinction; for when no scope is given to such reasoning within the Church, active minds often seek the liberty which is denied them in schisms and heresies, which might be avoided if they were turned aside from their own imaginations by theories of a more Catholic tendency. And, indeed, certain expositions of particular texts, and views of particular doctrines, become popular and traditional in sections of the Church, and are held often in a debased and lifeless way, for want of deeper thought; so that it is often a very desirable thing that these should be re-examined and tested afresh. Not that everything should be called in question. Much of the received interpretation of Holy Scripture amongst ourselves is

thoroughly sound and good, and great harm is done by suggesting that such and such texts may mean otherwise than they are commonly supposed to mean, where no good ground can be shown for the opinion or the doubt. Such questioning may lead the weaker sort to suppose that Holy Writ, after all, gives but an uncertain sound as to the main points of faith,—a notion which doubtless implies no little ignorance, but which easily obtains countenance from minds inclined to hesitation and unfixedness. But truth is worth some risk even to faith; and it is better to use theory and conjecture with moderation, and in their own place, in order to keep the mind in an inquiring and acquiring position, than to rest in imaginary certainty upon ill-founded assumptions. Two principles are especially to be borne in mind, if we venture at all on such processes of thought. First, that if we admit an interpretation which contravenes any article of faith, we shall certainly be losing instead of gaining truth. Such interpretations are now and then plausible; but it is wonderful how the analogy of the faith helps, on the whole, toward the solution of Scripture difficulties, and how, in the course of long and thoughtful inquiry, it turns out to be the only key that will unlock *all*. We may, however, often in the course of inquiry, have to give up interpretations which we have thought confirmatory of articles of faith. This is a wholly different question; and it may be safely said of any single text, that the faith will stand the same without it. Caution is doubtless required even in this case; but it is carried to excess if it makes us resist or materially distrust reason and fair argument; while any apparent opposition to the faith ought to make us call in question our own information or our mental processes, because we are assured of the faith on such good grounds, that reason itself declares the probability of error to be on the other side.

Secondly, that we may be losers, even without the unsettling of our faith, by adopting a narrow and particularized view, where revelation has not specified so exactly what we are to think. We may exclude a truth, and limit our conceptions to the range of a doubtful, and perhaps erroneous, hypothesis, if we allow our minds to dwell on it with the exclusiveness of enthusiasm. With these cautions, duly observed and acted upon, theological theory becomes a healthy exercise, and only requires the further check of moderation in its use. It is subsidiary in its nature. The real divine is made by meditation on theological certainties, rather than by the exercise of the imagination on theological hypotheses.

NOTICES.

'An Easy, Practical, Hebrew Grammar, with Exercises, &c. and Key; 'and a Translation, with Notes critical, &c., of *Isaiah* LIII.;—in Letters to 'an English Duchess;—by the Rev. P. H. Mason, and H. H. Bernard.' (Cambridge: Hall.) Another 'Hebrew Grammar;' nor do we yet see even the beginning of the end. The last before us was a brief, but manly exposition of the New School of Comparative Philology applied to Hebrew: now we have to greet the associated labours of two doughty champions of the Old Rabbinic School of Hebraists indeed, such as 'the most straitest Hebrew of the Hebrews might welcome. And, waiving the preliminary questions, first of the fact, next of the desirableness, of addressing 'a Hebrew Grammar, in Sixty Letters,' to 'a Duchess,' we can warrant any student, of the most or least scholastic rank, in this work, a full, clear, and at once a most lowly and accomplished insight given into the phænomena of that most wondrous mechanism, (not even yielding to the Sanscrit in its own praise of perfection technical,) the Masoretic lore:—*phænomena*, we say advisedly; for, while of all that can be found on its wide surface, our authors gallantly display a thorough mastery, what blame is it to them if they achieve not that which they on principle repudiate—the happiness ('*Felix!*') or blessedness (ASHRÉI) of him, '*qui rerum potuit cognoscere* CAUSAS'? While we quite agree with the present authors (*v.* I. *p.* 221—223), that the New school of Hebraists are far too hasty and imperfect in their process of induction from the facts, nay, oftentimes too inexact and even rash sometimes in mis-direction of their modern canons of philology, we cannot but regret, however, that the Old school, (by the pen of these, their newest and right worthy representatives,) not only to the pitch of bigotry, refuse all reason, save the technical, amounting (perhaps fitly, on the supposition, for 'my Lady Duchess') to the woman's *ratio ultima*, 'it is, because it is;' but even challenge our unreasoning literary faith, in absolutely meaningless assertions of non-principle, such as, if even we might never hope for a solution of the difficulty, reason must recoil from. Our faith is rather, that there is a better time and state yet coming—nay, we trust soon coming—on this articulate-speech-echoing earth, when both schools may arrive together, (aided unconsciously, it may be, each by others' labours,) at the perfect daylight of a no less rational development than faithful revelation of primeval speech. Meanwhile we are content to hail these quick-recurring symptoms of a healthy, vigorous pursuit of Hebrew verity. The lively, blunt, outspoken plainness of both sides, thus far, may even give us pleasure, not unmixed however with sincere distress, that both alike, in sweeping condemnation, or more supercilious yet ignoring, of each others', and dogmatical assertion of their own, views, to the less biassed spectator of this grammatic tournament, betray at once deficiency of knowledge, and not strength, but weakness rather, even of conviction. For example, in what our joint-authors here, in earnest (not perhaps a whit too earnest) and reiterated

(*Let.* XXIX. 9, and LI.—LV. *passim*) eloquence, proclaim as 'the most vital part of Hebrew Grammar,' (*v.* I. *p.* 212,) nay, 'of import the most serious in doctrine also,' (II. p. 103, 104, 145—150), viz. the true theory of Tense, so called, in Hebrew, and the real power of the Vaw *conversive* (or, as Ewald calls it, *relative*, and Lee, *restrictive*); where we feel them to be only too much justified in combating as well the present (*Let.* LV. *v.* II. *p.* 137—150), as a late (*v.* II. *p.* 75—84, 88—134, *Let.* LI.—LIV.) lamented Regius Professor of Hebrew at Cambridge; the less heated bystander cannot but with poignant grief behold (each party somewhat right and greatly wrong) the Truth meanwhile to lie (*Is.* lix. 14,) fallen prostrate in the midst of this hot, eager swordplay, forcing the brave assailant 'of new theories' not to retract, indeed, his facts or arguments, (which, in the main, we must think just and masterly,) but surely to regret the tone of their assault on one, who, while the sheets, it seems, were passing through the press, (*v.* II. *p.* 112,) has passed from earthly censure to a calmer atmosphere and a more merciful tribunal. He has, doubtless, left his mantle with disciples, able as devoted, in due time and place (which are not here) to vindicate his memory from any conscious wrong to the inspired Word. Yet, after all these drawbacks, we must tender our warmest thanks to all the causers (known and unknown) of this valuable work, for a most real amusement and delightful study of its nobly adorned pages, fraught with clear, full, patient, nay at once exhaustive and suggestive disentanglements of knotty points of grammar, and elucidations of obscure yet vital texts of Scripture,[1] in a style (in this respect, at least, well chosen) to present them with clearness irresistible, (we may not say to the meanest,) but to the most lady-like, capacity. Whether these volumes were purposely, or not, originally written with a view to publication appears left in interesting doubt (*v.* II. *p.* 127), and matters little; though it oozes out (*v.* II. *p.* 208 237, 242), that what is here set down is calculated for the calibre of College students also, and the level of 'the University examinations;' nay, so high a standard of proficiency is here proposed to, and apparently accepted by 'her Grace,' that having, on the author's recommendation, ordered *Kimchi*'s *Michlól*, and *Ben Zev*'s *Talmúd Lashón 'Ibrí*, he congratulates her Lady ship, enlarging on 'their high authority, unrivalled excellence, such that 'no Hebrew Grammar, in any other language, can at all compare with 'these;' and ends with rather a severe judgment, 'that no one who *has not* 'read, and *cannot* read these, has any claim to be considered, or to think 'himself, a Hebrew scholar.'

'Illustrissimorum et Reverendissimorum, D.D. Johannis Van Santen 'Archiepiscopi Ultrajectensis, et Henrici Joannis Van Buul, Episcopi Har-'lemensis, Epistola ad Summum Pontificem Pium IX., de Literis Apostolicis, '*Ex qua die*, d. d. 4. M. Martii, 1853. Ultrajecti: apud J. A. Van Woesten-'berg 1853.'—Some time since we endeavoured to give our readers a sketch of the history of the National Church in Holland, down to the accession of

[1] *e. g.* Numb. xxii. 33, *v.* I. *p.* 537—539; Prov. xxvi. 4, 5, *v.* II. *p.* 8, Gen. ix. 5, *p.* 23, Psal. cxxx. 6, *p.* 72, Gen. iv. 23, *p.* 198, 199, and a hundred others; above all the '*Virtuous Woman's Eulogy*,' Prov. xxxi. 10—31, *Let.* xv. *v.* I. *p.* 75—84, *Let.* LIX. *v* II. *p.* 264—285, of which a full analysis is given; and, again, the crown of all, *Isaiah* lii. 13,—liii. 12, *Let.* LX. *p.* 293—349.

the present Archbishop of Utrecht, John Van Santen. Scarcely was that article published, when rumours began to be afloat that the Court of Rome intended to substitute a local Episcopate in that country for Vicars Apostolic. The opposition which the project met with in the Chambers is well known, as is the final success of Roman policy. The letter, of which we have given the title above, is a solemn protest of the rightful Archbishop of Utrecht and Bishop of Haarlem, against the intruders into these sees. If, as we suppose, it comes from the pen of Monseigneur Van Santen, it is a remarkable example of vigour of style and clearness of argument in extreme old age; for the venerable prelate is in his eighty-first year. The principal discussion turns on the character and proceedings of Sasbold Vosmar, and would not be interesting to an ordinary reader, unless he happened to be well read in that part of Dutch history. We will only give an example of the style: 'Although from thenceforth we might well, most 'holy Father, have despised these accusations, yet that we might make 'manifest our love and desire of peace, we did all that laid in our power to 'reply to them. We demanded judges who should take cognizance of the 'cause on the spot, remembering that which the Bishops of Africa wrote in 'ancient times to Pope Celestine: "The Canons of Nicæa have most 'prudently and most justly provided that every controversy should be 'ended on the spot on which it began." We engaged by letters, dated 'February 20, 1705, to submit to their judgment without any exception. 'What more could we do? But neither did our prayers, again and again 'made, nor the decrees of Councils and Popes, Nicholas the First, Adrian 'the First, and Leo X., avail anything..... One way remained to us by 'which, without detriment to the authority of the Chief Vicar of Christ, 'we might sufficiently defend ourselves from an unjust aggression. This 'way we took, induced thereto by the authority of that great defender of 'the Church and Pope, Gregory I., who says, 'That which I was bound to 'do I have not omitted; but if I am despised in my correction, it remains 'that I must call in the Church, and that according to the command of the 'Lord to Peter, *Tell it to the Church.*' To this supreme and infallible 'tribunal, then, which through all ages, and by all Catholics, has always 'been held the refuge of the weaker, and the safeguard of the afflicted, we, 'with our churches, solemnly appealed by deeds, bearing date, May 9th 'and July 18, 1719; and the same appeal has been since then repeated by 'us on account of the renewed injuries which we have suffered. Protected 'by this as by a firm shield, and trusting in the assistance of the Divinity, 'we have placidly and quietly remained in our offices.' The conclusion of the letter is as follows:—'We have no cause for fear that this our reply 'should be made matter of accusation against us by your Holiness, for none 'can be endued with such great gifts as not to acquiesce in the saying of 'the great Cyprian: "We are not conquered, but instructed, when that 'which is better is set before us, specially in matters which pertain to the 'unity of the Church, and to the truth of our hope and faith." So far as 'we are concerned, holy Father, God is our witness, that if we have written 'too boldly, it is our desire in no respect to detract from the dignity of the Holy See, which, as sincere Catholics, we venerate and revere. We have said no more than—we fear we have not said so much—as was necessary

'for the defence of the truth and of our rights; and we ask but one thing; 'that you, holy Father, would, with the wisdom divinely bestowed on 'you, examine our cause in the balance of truth, so that if it should be 'found just, to you may belong the glory of restoring to our so long trou- 'bled churches, on equable terms, the peace which we desire. With great 'veneration, we subscribe ourselves your Holiness's most humble servants, 'John Van Santen, Archbishop of Utrecht: (Utrecht, August 9, 1853;) 'Henry John Van Buul, Bishop of Haarlem: (Amsterdam, August 10, '1853.')

A second volume of Mr. Landon's 'Ecclesiastical Dictionary' (Rivingtons) has been recently published. We observe very great care and attention displayed in this difficult work, which reflects high credit on the diligence of the compiler. No English work is so full on the facts and history of the foreign Churches: and we trust that nothing will prevent the completion of a work most creditable to its author and serviceable to the student. We should have been glad, though we are unable to point out the method of acquiring so stupendous an amount of information, had the lists of Bishops, &c. been carried below the termination of the annals of the Italia Sacra, Le Quien, &c.

Two portions of a 'Plain Commentary' (embracing the whole of S. Matthew and S. Mark) on the Gospels, (J. H. Parker,) we consider a very extraordinary work in every way. To be at once so full and yet so popular, so deep and yet so homely (in the best sense of that word), are rare recommendations. In size, cheapness, and in working character, if we may so say, it ought to supersede all our common Family Bibles. It is the book not only for simple, plain, devotional readers, but it is suggestive to the most advanced student of Scripture: and it realizes what has so long been wanted, a Catholic interpretation and comment for the people: a gloss yet religious, a commentary yet not dull, an explanation yet not pedantic.

Mr. George Gorham—the able son of one, who, with all his sad and painful history, is not to be denied the possession of considerable abilities—has printed his Hulsean Prize Essay on the 'Episcopate of the Ante-Nicene Church.' (Bell.) It is a performance of considerable research and large promise.

This is not the place for us to enter at full into all that we might have to say on such books as the 'Ministry of Consolation—a Guide to Confession.' (Masters.) Much of what we said last quarter, with respect to a work in some respects similar, applies to this. We frankly admit that all who use the ordinance of confession, be it to a priest, or only to Almighty God, require devotional manuals, and those of a specific kind: nor are we saying that many of the directions and hints conveyed in this book have not their value. There never was a work of the sort, nor even a volume of casuistical theology, which had not some, perhaps a large, amount of good. But the virtue required in such compositions is that of prudence and discretion: the most admirable tact, severe judgment, and the nicest discrimination, as well as solid sense, is what makes such manuals useful. Without them the best intentions become mischievous. We are bound to say that, in our judgment, the writer of this 'Guide' is deficient in these

qualifications. The language, sentiment, and style—to say nothing of other and more serious drawbacks—have an artificial and sentimental aspect, which we fear is calculated to repel rather than to attract religious sensibilities; and as compared to the vigorous manly tone of the Commentary on the Gospels which we have just spoken of, this volume is as patchouli to the incense-breathing morn.

Mr. Mayow, in a 'Few Words to Soldiers and Sailors,' (Masters,) has, while avoiding the discursiveness which affects his occasional publications, produced in a small compass, a valuable, seasonable, and judicious tract. To a less accomplished or inveterate student of Shakspere than Mr. Mayow is known to be the Camp scene from Henry V. comes in awkwardly.

We never could ourselves see the use of the ordinary helps to catechising which are, even when right, which they usually are, superfluous to a sensible, and useless to all incapable, catechists. However, a 'Set of Questions on the Collects,' (J. W. Parker,) edited by Mr. Claughton, seems to supply all that can be required in this kind of manual.

Mr. Brown, of Old Street, has purchased what is in the trade called 'the remainder' of two works forming part of the Parker Society Series, 'Liturgies and Occasional Forms of Prayer, temp. Elizabeth,' and 'Private Prayers' of the same period. We recommend our readers to purchase them, as they can now do at a very cheap rate. They are exceedingly valuable and important. The last-named volume contains that work of such immense liturgical importance, Elizabeth's Primer of 1559, which, in fact, was Henry VIII.'s Primer of 1545. Here then we find sanctioned by a high amount of practical authority, long after the Reformation was firmly established, the Dirige and Prayers for the Dead. The Church of England did not require this proof of its admission of the lawfulness of the practice; but the testimony is very valuable, and we are thankful to the Parker Society for making it so largely known. The former volume contains the famous Latin Prayer Book of 1560, by Haddon, of which the present cautious and careful editor, Mr. Clay, remarks, 'it was enjoined upon the 'Universities, the great public schools, and the clergy, in their private devo-'tions,' Preface, p. xxvii. This translation (Haddon's) recognises and recommends the reservation of the Sacrament for the Sick:—'Si contingat eodem 'die Cœnam Domini in Ecclesia celebrari, tum sacerdos in cœna tantum 'Sacramenti servabit, quantum sufficit ægroto: et mox finita cœna, una 'cum aliquot ex his qui intersunt, ibit ad ægrotum et primo communicabit 'cum illis, qui assistunt ægroto, et interfuerunt cœnæ et postremo cum 'infirmo.' This justifies not only the practice of reservation, but proves the intention of permitting, if not recommending, the presence of persons at the Communion who did not then communicate; and we cannot see how the inference which Collier and L'Estrange draw from this book, of the intention of the Elizabethan Reformers to recur to Edward's first Prayer Book of 1549 can be resisted.

Mr. C. Marriott has reprinted, in a beautiful shape, from the Littlemore press, one of these Elizabethan Manuals, the 'Preces Privatæ.' This work, by Prynne and Cosin, is called the 'Elizabethan Orarium;' but it is an independent work, and of great importance. Mr. Marriott has reprinted

the edition of 1568 (the second); but it first appeared in nearly the same shape in 1564, and subsequently in 1573, and 1574. All these works are adaptations of the old *Horæ;* and from them Cosin's Devotions were derived.

A cheap and portable edition of Hanna's 'Life of Chalmers,' is appearing in quarterly instalments. (Constable.)

There is a pleasant, simple, affectionate earnestness in Mr. H. J. Pye's 'Short Ecclesiastical History,' (Masters,) which justifies us in pronouncing it a good school and family book.

Courbon's 'Familiar Instructions in Mental Prayer' (J. H. Parker), one of Dr. Pusey's devotional works, is enriched with a preface, which, in its judicious careful language, favourably contrasts with some manuals with which we are occasionally and painfully compelled to express our dissatisfaction.

A Clergyman of the old school, and an excellent specimen of it, Mr. Wix, of S. Bartholomew's, has published a comment on the 'Marriage Service,' (Rivingtons,) which is, what some modern works on kindred subjects are not, wise and thoughtful.

Mr. Mozley's abridged and very cheap edition of Jeremy Taylor's 'Life of Christ,' brings that admirable manual within the range of cottage circulation, to which it is, as experience finds, remarkably suited.

'Tractarianism no Novelty,' (Masters,) is a reprint of Dean Stanley's 'Faith and Practice of a Church of England Man,' with some warm-hearted notes and illustrations, by a Manchester layman of considerable zeal, Mr. G. F. Mandley. It is a useful counterpoise to a scandalous edition of the same work put forth by Mr. R. Eden, with disparaging and contradictory notes.

Mr. Mason Neale's Lecture on 'Confession and Absolution,' (Masters,) is a very neat and compact specimen of occasional controversy, complete and crushing, and withal judicious.

The 'Essay on the Plurality of Worlds,' (J. W. Parker,) which is generally attributed to Dr. Whewell, is certainly one of the most remarkable works of the day. We cannot in this place take a side on the question: but we are bound to say, that a more agreeable book we have seldom met with; and competent authorities speak as highly of the science as we can do of the style. The subject in dispute may fairly be considered an open one, resting, as the arguments on either side must do, on proofs very distantly approximating to demonstration. Certain speculations on an ideal perfectibility of the present Cosmos, towards the end of this engaging volume, strike us as irreconcilable with the literal declarations of Revelation.

In our judgment the Collects are incapable of a metrical rendering; we can therefore only sympathise with the purpose of a Durham Theological Student, who prints 'Flowers from the Garden of the Church.' (J. W. Parker.)

Few writers of promise have so completely disappointed a brilliant rising as Mr. Martin F. Tupper. He has subsided into a vapid grumbler, advo-

cating a faint and vague socialism. He comes out on all occasions, and often on no occasion, with 'A Dozen Ballads on Church Abuses,' which read very much like the leading articles of the *Morning Advertiser* or the *Weekly Dispatch* done into dreary doggrel; or, as more recently, with 'Ballads about White Slavery, (Bosworth,) which are founded upon that shallow sentimentalism which would make trade unlawful, and hired labour impossible; and 'A Batch of War Ballads,' which are very slack-baked and indigestible. We may as well give specimens of Mr. Tupper, both as the Ecclesiastes and the Tyrtæus of the occasion. Mr. Tupper is speaking of the miners:—

'Good Ashley! thine is the eye
To pity and help such a slave;
Priest and Levite, both pass by,
[This, Mr. Tupper, we beg to deny,]
But this Samaritan still draws nigh
His generous hands still save!
And yet how much remains to be done;
For though in a Blue-book the battle be won,
—They still drag coal-corves ton by ton,
White slaves from cradle to grave!'
White Slavery Ballads, p. 23.

Mr. Tupper moralizes and poetizes on the French alliance in these vigorous lyrics; from which we gather, at any rate, the Gallic origin of the slang phrase, 'to sell a person:'—

'Rochefoucault and others tell us,
In our friendships to take heed
Lest our friends hereafter sell us,
Turning to be—foes in need;
And old Talleyrand advises
Every man his friends to greet,
Much as foes in fair disguises,
And his foes as friends to treat.
* * * *
'No,—we've not the least suspicion
But of unison with us,—
Everybody's general mission
Is to stop this recreant Russ;
Everybody means to do it,
And to make him pay the shot;
Deeply must the despot rue it,
Might were Right if he did not.'
War Ballads, p. 24.

Gasparin's 'Schools of Doubt and the School of Faith,' (Constable,) has attracted sufficient reputation to justify its translation, which has been carefully executed by R. B. Watson. The work itself is unsatisfactory.

Mr. Griffith's translation of 'The Birth of the War God,' from Kálidása, (Allen,) is certainly a contribution to our poetical literature. We had occasion to speak well of previous specimens of old Indian poetry from the same author. In the present poem the heroic metre is very successfully used: and the old epic character characteristically retained.

Dr. Wordsworth's 'Notes at Paris,' (Rivingtons,) is in some sense a continuation of, and in the same spirit, and with the same practical aim as, a previous work on the subject. We hope some day to give a paper to Parisian Christianity; when the present unpretending little volume will receive, as it deserves, a fuller notice.

There is some curious thought in a strange-looking book of fragments, 'The Sensibility of Separate Souls considered; by Caleb Webb,' (Houlston & Stoneman,) but as far as we can understand him, the writer rejects the Christian doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body.

Mr. Woodgate's series of 'Sermons on the Old Testament Sunday Lessons,' (J. W. Parker,) are plain, direct, and interesting.

Among Sermons in anticipation of the War—we regret to say, the present war—we prefer two by Mr. Boone, (J. W. Parker,) to one by Mr. Harston

of Tamworth. (J. H. Parker.) The latter adopts the incredible tradition, that in the massacre of the Innocents, 14,000 'helpless children were murdered.' Nelson, in the 'Fasts and Festivals,' we think, did not go beyond 10,000.

The most important book of the quarter—it, however, only reaches us while at press—is Dean Milman's elaborate 'History of Latin Christianity.' (Murray.) This work is connected with, but can hardly be said to be a sequel of, the author's 'History of Christianity,' already published. It proposes to conduct the history of the Western Church down to the pontificate of Nicholas V.; within sight, that is, of the rise of what the Dean calls 'Teutonic Christianity.' The present three volumes are only an instalment of the whole undertaking. We trust to give a work which, in its scholarly aspect, methodical form, and elaborate research, recalls the old formal mode of writing history, that attention which it demands.

There is some difficulty, at least in this place, in going beyond the announcement of 'Essays and Reviews,' by R. W. Church, (Mozleys,) seeing that this volume consists almost exclusively of papers which have appeared in our own pages. But we only repeat the judgment which the public and all critics have long since passed on the compositions of one of our most respected and valued contributors, when we say that to a conscientious and laborious research, Mr. Church adds a vigorous and picturesque style, and a power of grouping and arrangement which places him in the very front rank of living writers.

A careful and full volume 'Weiss' History of the French Protestant Refugees,' (Blackwood,) has been translated by Mr. F. Hardman. It fills a blank in recent Church History, connected with an interesting and often pathetic narrative, and with a vast and careful reference to obscure and evanescent facts.

Dr. Moberly's small volume, 'The Law of the Love of God,' (Nutt,) is a refined and searching commentary on the first Table of the Decalogue, in which there is a good deal of criticism on Dr. Newman's recent volume on Development, as well as some practical teaching on certain defects in our popular English religion.

Mr. Sanderson Robins, on the 'Claims of the Church of Rome, (Longmans,) exhibits a good deal of the older, and we believe, sounder method of controversy. He has read on the subject, and reproduces, though with variety of illustration and perspicuity, arguments which have never been refuted.

A third, and cheap, edition of Archdeacon Wilberforce's work 'On the Eucharist,' and a second edition of Mr. W. Jackson's admirable 'Village Sermons,' both published by Messrs. Mozley, attest the hold which in either case has been gained on public confidence. We regret to see from a recent publication by Archdeacon Denison, that the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist in the English Church is likely to receive judicial, and therefore irreverent, because inadequate, investigation. Had prudence accompanied the zeal which undeniably has led to this result, a step which may be injurious, must be painful, and can produce no good, might have been saved.

L.

Liguori, S. Alphonso, on Truthfulness [*Theologia Moralis, &c.*], 38—87. Presumed sanctity of the Roman communion, 38; how dispelled, 39; Liguori, 40. Amphibology, 41; its principles, 42—50; its application, 51—66. Treatise on Equivocation, 67—74; contrasted with S. Augustine *De Mendacio*, 75—78. Bishop Sanderson, 78—83; and Holy Scripture, 84—86; practical application, 87.

Loretto, the Holy House of [*Histoire Critique de Lorette, &c. Par M. Caillau, &c.*], 334—377. Peculiar necessity of Roman Catholics accepting the extravagancies of their system, 334. Sense of infallibility and authority, 335—338. The House of Loretto, 339. Caillau and Rohrbacher, 380; alleged patristic and ancient authorities, 341—353. Phocas, 355. Benedict XIV. 359. History and progress of the legend, 360—377.

M.

Maurice, Professor [*Theological Essays, &c.*] 200—243. General philosophical character of the writer's speculations, 201; on Conscience, 202; on Bishop Butler's views, 203—213; on the Atonement, 214—220; on the Eternity of Punishment, 221—240. Postscript, 242, 243.

N.

Nicæa, Council of [*Bishop Kaye on the Council of Nicæa, &c.*], 125—173. Character of the work, 125; well timed, 126. Sketch of the Arian controversy, and life and labours of S. Athanasius, 127—173.

P.

Pulpit, the French [*The Preacher and the King, &c.*] 88—124. Unreal character of the work, 88, 89. Its Plot, 90, 91. Character of the French pulpit, 92—96. Bossuet, 96—100. Bourdaloue, 100—104. Massillon, 104—107. Contrasted, 107—114. Sermons in general, and need of improvement, 115—124.

SHORTER NOTICES OF BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

JANUARY.—Purchas' Book of Feasts—Mr. I. Williams' Sermons for Sundays and Festivals —Landmarks of History—Comper's Lectures on the Church—Short Sermons for the Lord's Supper — Companion to Confession, &c. — Readings for Sundays and Holy Days — Church Hymnal—Autobiography of a Five-pound Note — Magazine for the Young — Merriman's Passages in Missionary Life—History of France—Work: Plenty to do, and how to do it—Bp. Colenso's Village Sermons —Sermons for the Christian Seasons—Stories and Catechisings on the Collects—Commentary on S. Matthew—South African Church Magazine — Poems by Arnold, Debenham, Payn, and Peel—Doctrine de l'Eglise Anglicane—Boone's Sermons—Murray's Railway Reading—Robertson's History of the Christian Church — Cowie's Hulsean Lectures — Hints on Clerical Reading—Conversations on the Choral Service—Carter on Church Penitentiaries—Greek Concordance to the Holy Bible — Tract on Cholera — Rosaries — Bible Society — Blackader's English Bible — Sir Ælfric—Statement and Correspondence between the Lord Primate of Ireland and Rev. G. Williams—Decease of Dr. Mill.

APRIL.—Mason and Bernard's Hebrew Grammar — Appeal of the Jansenist Bishops — Landon's Ecclesiastical Dictionary — Plain Commentary on the Gospels—G. Gorham's Prize Essay—Mayow to Soldiers, &c.—Questions on the Collects—Elizabethan Prayer Books, &c.—Preces Privatæ—Life of Chalmers—Pye's Short Ecclesiastical History—Courbon on Mental Prayer — Wix on the Marriage Service—Taylor's Life of Christ—Tractarianism no Novelty—Neale on Confession—Essay on the Plurality of Worlds—Flowers from the Garden of the Church—Tupper's Ballads — Gasparin's Schools of Doubt, &c.—Birth of the War God—Notes at Paris — Sensibility of separate Souls — Woodgate's Old Testament Sermons — Sermons on the War—Milman's History of Latin Christianity—Church's Essays—Weiss' History of the French Protestant Refugees—Moberly's Law of the Love of God—Robins on Claims of the Roman Church—Wilberforce on the Eucharist—Jackson's Village Sermons—Manual of Prayers for Communicants—Morning Thoughts—White on Symbolism — Liddell's Reply — Ingle's Letter — Whitaker's Educational Register — Journal of Philology—Gorrie's Botanical Illustrations of Scripture—Sermons by Harston, Browne, Lowe, Wilkins, Proctor, Jones, Hamilton, Molyneux, Gresley, Bp. of Oxford, H. Goodwin, Randolph, Lomas, Gutch, &c.

ERRATA.—No. LXXXIV.

P. 261, l. 36, *for* 'many' *read* 'nay.'
P. 264, l. 20 and 25, *for* 'παρηκολουθήκοτες' *read* 'παρηκολουθηκότες.'
P. 268, l. 19, *for* 'præsribetur' *read* 'præscribetur.'
P. 272, l. ult. for '(A.D. 736)' *read* '(A.D. 376).'
P. 275, last line but two, *dele* 'about A.D. 400.'
P. 291, l. 1, *for* 'Lastly' *read* '2. Again.' L. ult. *for* 'καὶ' *read* 'κοὶ.'
P. 296, l. 14, *for* 'repeatedly' *read* 'in two places.'
P. 302, l. 22, *for* 'is improbable' *read* 'is not improbable.'
P. 303, l. 38, *read* 'quite naturally, speaking of,' &c.
P. 306, l. 19, *for* 'Collection' *read* 'Collections;' or for 'make' *read* 'makes.' L. 21, *for* 'are' *read* 'were.'

R. CLAY, PRINTER, BREAD STREET HILL.

THE

CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

A

Quarterly Review.

VOL. XXVIII.

JULY—DECEMBER.

LONDON:
PUBLISHED BY J. & C. MOZLEY,
6, PATERNOSTER ROW;
AND D. APPLETON & CO. 200, BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

1854.

LONDON:
R. CLAY, PRINTER, BREAD STREET HILL.

THE

CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

JULY, 1854.

ART. I. — *Concionalia. By the Rev.* H. THOMPSON, M.A., *Vicar of Chard.* London: Masters.

No long time ago, in examining a village church in one of the midland counties, the attention of a casual visitor was attracted by a paper in the Rector's pew, which somewhat resembled a placard. On investigation it was found to be a sermon, headed, *On the Vanity and Uncertainty of Human Life*, and labelled, 'in case of an accident.' If, by chance, the worthy Incumbent should happen to forget the discourse he intended to deliver, here was a safe reserve. Human life was sure always to be uncertain; moralists would always call it vain; the sermon, therefore, could never come *mal-à-propos*, and there it lay, bearing amusing witness to the character and value of—we will take the liberty of coining a word—English Homiliology.

Of all stiff, unreal, stilted demonstrations of religion, probably the sermons of the last century were the most remarkable specimens; and, if perhaps nowhere to be found in their original pasteboard and brocade character, they are still formidable enough in the compositions of the school which denominates itself orthodox and moderate, and which is termed by others high-and-dry. The sermons which came from the pulpits of Potter and Lavington, of Cornwallis and North, were like the hoops and toques of the routs and of Ranelagh; an outrageous caricature of formality, that must have disgusted any century except the seventeenth. When Blair was held up by Johnson —a man in so many respects before his age—as the model of pulpit eloquence, when the dictum of the great doctor was, that his sermons were *more golden than gold*, what must have been the depth of the degradation to which church oratory had sunk! Wherever we turn it is the same thing. At the beginning of the century, Addison, a man of deep religious feeling, commends Sir Roger's plan for the instruction of the Worcestershire peasants. 'At the chaplain's first settling with me, I made him a

'present of all the good sermons which have been printed in 'English, and only begged that every Sunday he would pro- 'nounce one of them in the pulpit. I could heartily wish,' says the Spectator, 'that some of our country clergy would follow 'this example; and instead of wasting their spirits in laborious 'compositions of their own, would endeavour after a handsome 'elocution and all those other talents that are proper to 'enforce what has been penned by greater masters. This 'would not only be more easy to themselves, but more edifying 'to the people.' Imagine a country congregation, year after year, listening, open-mouthed, to the glittering wit of South, the polished prettinesses of Tillotson, the heavy learning of Stillingfleet, the profounder erudition of Lloyd: the same Sunday always producing the same sermon, whatever might be the circumstances of the hearers,—the priest never able to appeal to local events, home occurrences, anything, in short, that could touch and interest; the instructor turned into a sermon-machine, and the sermons so evolved as unintelligible as if they had been written in Latin. And this was at the beginning only of that age—our Church's passage through the Valley of the Shadow of Death. Time went on; religion was in England almost, and in the Scotch Establishment entirely, eliminated from the pulpit. We find Clayton consulting Lady Suffolk—a Bishop taking advice from an adulteress —on the composition of a sermon. We may read—if we have patience—in every episcopal charge, the watchword that was afterwards Talleyrand's, *surtout point de zèle;* we see Doctors of Divinity delivering with universal applause the same sermons which they had produced before an university audience, to criminals, condemned, and struggling, in the last agonies of their earthly existence, to make their peace with God. We find, as Wesleyanism developed the numerous resources of natural preaching, the laced coat of the 'orthodox' party stiffening into cast-iron, their somnolence morphinised into death. Persons, we believe, are now living, who can remember a curate hunted from a metropolitan pulpit because it was his custom to raise his eyes from his manuscript. Persons who have not long been dead, could recollect the discourse delivered by a dignitary in the parish church of S. Giles, and addressed to three classes,—the good, the bad, and the indifferent. The good were told that they needed no advice,—let them persevere in their righteousness, and the kingdom of heaven would be their reward; the bad—but in such a congregation (S. Giles's!) it was uncharitable to suppose that such a class could be found; the indifferent lost much by not exerting a little more energy, in order that their reward might not only be rendered more certain, but more

brilliant. And this precious theology occupied in its enunciation exactly five minutes! But this was light and fervour in comparison with what we are told of the pulpit eloquence of the Scotch Establishment. James Haldane tells us that, in one of his missionary tours, he heard a minister solemnly warn his people against putting any trust, while they continued sinners, in the blood of Christ. 'Repent,' said he, 'become righteous, 'atone for your crimes by probity and virtue, and then, if you 'please, you may look to that blood, but not before.' Much about the same time Paley was assuring his hearers that the being born again meant nothing; 'nothing,' that is, 'to us, and 'in our circumstances.'

But it is not our intention to dwell on these miserable details of an age that has long since rendered an account of its spiritual neglect to God. Fearful must have been its reckoning for the souls that should not have died, and were nevertheless slain by its neglect. We turn to a more attractive subject; the sermons of those ages, the darkness of which excited the ridicule or the pity of the preachers of the last.

Mediæval ritual and mediæval architecture have, in some degree, received their meed of attention. Mediæval sermons have not yet found an historian. It will be our endeavour, in the following pages, not to enter into an essay on the subject, which would require a volume as immense as some of those of which it would treat; but to offer a few remarks on the practical bearing which the topic may assume as regards ourselves. We shall try to show, not what the preachers of the middle ages did, but some few things which we may learn from them to do or to avoid.

Leaving the consideration of such early treatises as that of S. Augustine, *De Doctrinâ Christianâ*, or such late ones as that of S. Charles Borromeo, *De Instructione Prædicatoris*, we may remark, that we have two mediæval Arts of Preaching. The one is the work of Guibert de Nogent, concerning the proper method of making a sermon. This learned Abbat, who died in 1124, gives us, however, little further information than this: that the preacher should exercise his talent as often as possible; should never mount the pulpit without prayer; should, above all things, be short, and should rather dwell on practical than dogmatical subjects. He notices that some, in his day, renounced preaching from the fear of vainglory, and the dread of being named *sermoners* and ventriloquists; a reproach which, it need not be added, is as old as the time of S. Gregory Nazianzen. The other is the treatise by Humbert[1] de Romanis, General of the Order of S. Dominic, in the second book of his work

[1] It is in the twenty-fifth volume of the Lyons *Bibliotheca Maxima*.

entitled, *De Institutione religiosorum Prædicatorum*, where he professes to teach 'a way of promptly producing a sermon for any set of men, and for all variety of circumstances.'

In looking at the immense mass of mediæval sermons, it is necessary that those who would not become absolutely bewildered, should keep steadily in view certain points which are not usually expressed in the headings of those compositions. As for example: whether what we now have be the sermon as the author intended it to be read, or the sermon notes from which he actually delivered it; whether it were taken down by one of his auditors from extemporaneous delivery, or written by himself; whether it were addressed to the clergy, to the people, or to monks; above all, whether it were written in Latin, or translated from the vernacular into that language. Let us give an example or two of each of these different characters. And first of cases in which the sermon, as we now have it, was manifestly extemporaneous.

No one can doubt that many of S. Augustine were so. Look at those on the Two Castings of the Net,[1] among the Paschal Homilies. One glance at these will convince the reader that they were taken down at the time by some diligent hearer, and afterwards either came into the possession of the Bishop, or were published by the affectionate zeal of some of his disciples. The conclusion of all differs no further than would naturally result from the involuntary variations of an extemporary preacher, intending, in different years, to say the same thing. Thus, in explaining the mystical signification of the 153 fishes, S. Augustine thus speaks in the first sermon:—

'This number signifies the thousand thousands of the saints and of the faithful. But why did the LORD vouchsafe to signify by these figures the many thousands who shall enter into the kingdom of heaven? Hear why. Ye know that the Law was given by Moses to the people of God; and that in that Law the Decalogue forms the chief part. . . . . These ten precepts no man accomplishes by his own strength, unless he is helped by the grace of God. If therefore none can fulfil the law unless God assist with His Spirit, ye must remember that the Holy Ghost is set forth to us by the number seven. . . . . Since, then, we need the Spirit to fulfil the Law, add seven to ten, and you have seventeen. Now, if you count from one to seventeen, you obtain one hundred and fifty-three. I need not count this up for you; count it for yourselves, and reckon thus: one and two and three and four make ten. In like manner add up the other numbers to seventeen, and you will have the holy number of the faithful and of the saints that shall be in heavenly places with the Lord.'[1]

In the next sermon we have the same out-of-the-way thought in almost the same language:—

'As the Law is signified by the Decalogue, so the Holy Ghost is set forth as septiform. . . . . Thus we get seventeen. The Law commands, the

[1] Ed. S. Maur. Ser. 249—253.

Spirit assists: the Law so acts upon thee that thou knowest thy duty: the Spirit, that thou dost it. Therefore let us keep on reckoning to seventeen, and we shall find ourselves at a hundred and fifty-three. You know how; I have often told you; I have often shown you. Two comes after one: two and one are three: three comes after two, which make six: four comes after three; there we have ten. Add the rest; and when you get up to seventeen you will also have arrived at a hundred and fifty-three.'

In the third sermon these curious expressions are again repeated:—

'Add ten to seven, and you have seventeen. By this number all the multitude of the perfect is typified; but how we arrive at a hundred and fifty-three I am accustomed to tell you, and many are beforehand with me. .... Many have forgotten, some never heard; let those then that have heard and have not forgotten bear patiently with me, that others may be instructed.'

And then he goes on as before. The remarkable expression, 'and many are beforehand with me,' can scarcely be explained but by the supposition that people actually began to count on their fingers (as S. Augustine tells us in another place) when their preacher commenced the well-known topic; a method of interruption not at all without parallel in the primitive Church, as so many patristic allusions remain to show: whether the contempt with which S. Chrysostom rejects all open expressions of feeling, or the more than toleration with which the *quod non tacito honorastis affectu* of S. Leo receives them.

It seems next to certain that most of the *Sermones varii* of Venerable Bede were also extemporary. The extreme brevity of some of them, (for occasionally they do not exceed seven or eight lines,) renders it impossible that the preacher said no more than that which now stands in his works. And again, the great simplicity which characterises all, the repetition of words, and the reiteration of the noun instead of adoption of the pronoun, are just what we should expect to find in extemporaneous addresses to a very ignorant congregation. For example: one on the text, 'Man that is born of a woman,' &c., commences thus: 'But the soul cannot die; but when it departs from the body, 'the body soon dies; and before it departs from the body, it is 'in great terror, because it sees S. Michael, who is waiting for 'it; and it is afraid to go forth on account of the bands of 'miserable souls.' Bede then tells the celebrated story of S. Macarius and the head in the wilderness, and forthwith concludes; the sermon, as it stands now, taking about two minutes to deliver. No doubt some one of his disciples jotted down a brief abstract of what the preacher had said, very probably for his own use on some other occasion; and it is a collection of such abstracts that has since formed a part of the author's works.

It is curious how long an impression prevailed that extemporary preaching was the invention of the Puritans. Some of

our readers may remember the amusing vehemence of indignation with which a writer, of whom the Church of England may certainly say, *Non tali auxilio*, pursues it in her 'Vicar of Wrexhill.' The truth is, that the innovation, which appears to date somewhere from the time of Queen Elizabeth, was the carrying a written sermon into the pulpit. The mediæval practice was no doubt the same with that of the continental churches of the present day, that the preacher should repeat from memory that which he had previously composed.

Another example or two to the same effect may be found in the works of S. Hildebert, Archbishop of Tours, who died in 1134. In his sixty-third sermon we have this sentence: 'for Leon in Greek signifies a king.' It is manifest that Hildebert said, 'Basileon,'[1] and that the first two syllables were inaudible to the copyist. In the same discourse, also, the preacher lays great stress on the *seven* lions which stood on this side and on that of Solomon's throne, whereas Holy Scripture expressly declares that there were *twelve*, and the type was a celebrated one:

'Da, ad thronum gradibus
Senis conscendamus;
Bis senos leunculos
Tunc non timeamus.'

In like manner, and also arising from the hurry of extempore speaking, we find S. Hildebert frequently quoting Holy Scripture very inaccurately, even where a more literal citation would better have served his purpose. And again, there are passages where it is indeed possible to see what the author meant, but where no grammatical construction can elicit that meaning from the words as they stand. Such is one which we give in a note from the thirty-fourth sermon.[2]

A still more remarkable instance of the way in which an extempore sermon has reached us, is to be found by comparing the sixth and the sixty-first of the same author. The two are identical, though expressed, for the most part, in somewhat different words. The fact seems to have been, that both a monk of Saint Germain-des-Pres, and one of Angers, were present at the delivery of the discourse, and that each took notes for his own edification, he of Angers being the better reporter of the two. The consequence was, that the copies transcribed from the MSS. of the respective monasteries, appeared as two different sermons in the S. Maur edition. The editor, Beaugendre,

[1] The reader need scarcely be reminded how inaccurate in their terminations were mediæval writers when they had to quote a Greek word.

[2] Sed qui reconciliantur, alii finitâ pœnitentiâ parati ad Corpus Domini percipiendum, alii nondum digni sunt sacramentum, quiâ nondum pœnitentiam finierunt: sed ad gaudium tantæ festivitatis communicandi ex indulgentiâ ad tantum ecclesiâ vel recipiuntur, ut integrum corpus esse gaudeant, et de peccatis resurgone hujus festivitatis ad suprema gaudia perennia.

observed the similarity of the two; and says in his note on the latter, 'This sermon has a great affinity with that on the Incarnation, which begins with the same words.' It is strange that the learned Benedictine did not see the origin of this affinity, or rather identity.

If we proceed from preaching strictly extemporary to preaching from notes, S. Antony of Padua would present the most striking example, could we be certain that he actually delivered the celebrated sermons which we now have from him. There is a clear distinction made in his life, between those which he preached with such wonderful effect to the people, and those which he wrote for the instruction and improvement of his brethren. 'The Bishop of Ostia,' says his biographer, 'exhorted him, when he had written his sermons *De Tempore*, to compose another series for the festivals of Saints. He obeyed, and while still at Padua, gave himself up to this work. But the holy time of Lent coming on, the man of God perceiving 'that now was 'the accepted time, now was the day of salvation, put off that 'composition, and applied himself wholly to preach to the people, 'who thirsted with great eagerness for his sermons.'

It is perhaps not improbable that what he wrote in brief, and by way of notes, was afterwards delivered in full, and with such extemporaneous additions as might occur. At all events, his work can only be called *sermon skeletons*, however much his editors may entitle it *Sermones* Sancti Antonii.

S. Hildebert, to whom we have just referred, affords, also, instances of preaching from notes. In a Lent sermon, for example, the following paragraph now occurs in the printed copies: 'Seek ye the Lord while He may be found; call upon 'Him because He is now swift to pardon, hereafter He will be 'prepared to judge. Learn by an example how swift He is to 'pardon. *And I will give an example.* Learn by this example, 'beloved brethren, to be instigated, without loss of time, to peni-'tence, and to be converted to the Lord.' Who does not see that the words, 'and I will give an example,' were merely a marginal note, set down by the preacher for his own private use; such an instance of God's mercy as might happen to occur to him, being inserted, in the heat of delivery, extemporaneously?

Again, in the thirty-eighth sermon, which was preached to the nuns of Fontevraud, we have the following extraordinary abbreviation: 'Primus populus, homines sunt mali, qui a bono 'retrahunt; secundus, desideria carnis, quæ mala suggerunt; 'tertius, cogitationes mentis, quæ peccare cogunt. De primo 'populo scriptum est; Si d. m. t. S. t. a. esse pro
'De secundo: Abstinete vos a carnalibus desideriis, quæ mili-'tant adversus animam.'

The after insertions and marginal references which such a system of notes rendered necessary, are referred to by Herbert of Bosham, in the preface to his Gloss on the Psalter. 'If,' says he, to the prelate whom he is addressing, 'your scribes should 'undertake the transcription of these commentaries, let them 'take diligent care to insert the references and notes in their 'right order; lest, as it often happens, through the ignorance 'or the negligence of the transcriber, it should be more difficult 'to correct the work than it was to write it; especially when the 'corrupter of a new work may be called the brother of its 'destroyer.'

The third point which should be considered in the perusal of any mediæval sermon is this; whether it were originally delivered in Latin, or in the vernacular language of the country. It is difficult to understand in what sense, and with what limitations, we are to receive the account of Bishops who in those ages preached from one end of Europe to the other. Probably till the death of Charlemagne, an ecclesiastic who could make himself intelligible to any of the Romance nations which his empire embraced, would be comprehended by all; and in like manner, one who was understood by a single Tudesque race, would be intelligible to any other. If two languages only were necessary in an empire which stretched from Mecklenburg to Tarragona, and from Brittany to Rome, a great portion of the difficulty is obviated. But, in later ages, when we know that the dialects of different provinces in the same country had become in effect different languages,—when, for example, the Langue d'oui and the Langue d'oc were unintelligible to each other,—then how apostolic missionaries could traverse half Europe becomes a question of greater obscurity. One thing seems next to certain; that the great preachers of those times, whenever they did use the vernacular language, spoke in it extempore; for who would take the trouble of committing his thoughts to a dialect so barbarous that perhaps it could not be written with precision, and so fluctuating that it was certain to be unintelligible within half a century? The *Sermones ad Populum* of the eighth, ninth, and tenth centuries, then, must either have been translated into Latin by some of the disciples of the author, from their remembrance of what he had actually spoken, or by the writer himself, from his recollection of the general scope and aim of his discourse.

We will now turn our attention to a few of the most distinguishing features which characterise mediæval sermons. And the first of these is, the immense and almost intuitive knowledge of Scripture which their writers possessed. If any one, to take the lowest view of the subject, will be at the trouble of com-

paring the number of references to be found in a modern, with those which occur in an ancient sermon, he will find that ten to one is by no means an exaggerated estimate of their relative proportions. Nor is this all. Modern quotations are almost entirely taken from certain books or chapters of the Bible; the more important portions, as men now-a-days irreverently, not to say profanely, call them. The ancient preachers drew their citations from all parts of Scripture alike: equally imbued with the spirit of all, it was impossible that they should quote otherwise than according to analogy. And those who more especially pique themselves on their knowledge of the Bible, and on declaring 'the whole counsel of God'—we mean, of course, the so-called Evangelicals—would do well to consider, how and why it is that their sermons, in comparison with those of which we are writing, are so jejune in references to the Word of God, and so shallow and common-place in their application when they quote it—why they evince, in short, rather the knowledge of a child than the full grasp of a theologian. Let us be fair, and give an example or two to prove the truth of what we say. We will take an unexceptionable writer on either side. The modern school cannot complain if we bring forward John Newton as their champion; and we will match him, not with S. Bernard, nor with any other such giant in divinity, but with a mere common-place pious writer of the twelfth century, Guarric, Abbat of Igniac. We will take them on the same subject, and on the same text, 'Prepare ye the way of the Lord.' In Newton's sermon we find nine references to the Gospels, two to the Epistles, nine to the prophets, one to the Psalms; while no allusion is made to any other part of Holy Scripture. In the sermon of Guarric there are seven references to the Gospels, one to the Epistles, twenty-two to the Psalms, nine to the Prophets, and eighteen to other parts of Scripture. Thus, the total number of quotations made by the Evangelical preacher is twenty-one; by Guarric, fifty-seven; and this in sermons of about equal length. Or, to take a more striking example of the same thing. In 1784, when the oratorio of the 'Messiah' was performed with great splendour in Westminster Abbey, it pleased the same John Newton to deliver a series of discourses on the texts which formed the subject of Handel's music. As those passages of Holy Scripture are so admirably well chosen, the sermons grounded on them were naturally intended to form a complete body of divinity, and as such were published together. By way of index, the author drew up a list of texts quoted or referred to, such as we see universally appended to the earlier editions of the Fathers. It is odd to remark how unequally the evangelical preacher makes his citations. From that part of the

Bible which precedes the Psalms he quotes very sparingly. The minor Prophets hardly furnish him with one passage; the Books of Joel, Obadiah, Nahum, and Jonah, absolutely with none. He nowhere refers to the Song of Solomon. To the Apocrypha, as might be expected, he makes but one allusion. The Epistles, especially those to the Romans, Galatians, and Ephesians, occupy a most disproportionable space, as regards the New Testament; and the prophecy of Isaiah, in reference to the Old. Now, if we turn to the same index in the works of S. Antony of Padua, we find at once that Holy Scripture is quoted evenly, and according to analogy. The historical books assume their due prominence; the Epistles are reduced to a lower level; and the quotations from each bear proportion to the length of the book, and not to the preconceived system of the preacher. The one point of similarity between S. Antony and Newton is the greater frequency with which both turn to the Psalms; and their most striking contrast, next to that which we have already specified, consists in the numerous references which the one makes to the Sapiential books, and, above all, to the Canticles; while, by the other, they are comparatively passed over.

But, after all, this is a very poor and imperfect way of representing the difference. Let us take another comparison, to show how, in the one case, the whole composition is imbued with Scripture; in the other, how detached texts are, as it were, tagged on, because it looked proper and sounded scriptural to introduce them. Let our preachers, each of them, commence a discourse upon Advent.

'One strong internal proof that the Bible is a divine revelation, may be drawn from the subject matter, and particularly that it is the book, and the only book, which teaches us to think highly and honourably of God. I say the only book; for there is no right knowledge of God where the Bible is not known. What is the Jupiter of Homer compared with the God of Israel, as He is represented to us by His servants the Prophets? And if the heathen philosophers in some detached passages have sentiments not altogether unworthy of Him, history honestly tells us how they obtain them. They travelled, and they are generally said to have travelled into Phenicia or Egypt, to the confines of that people who alone thought rightly of God, because to them only He had made Himself known by a revelation. If such a description as we have in the fortieth chapter of Isaiah, from the twelfth verse to the end, had been known only of late years, recovered, we will suppose, out of the ruins of Herculaneum, there is little doubt but it would have engaged the attention and admiration of the learned world; for the most admired writings of antiquity, upon a candid comparison, are unspeakably inferior to it. The inimitable sublimity of the prophets is natural, just, and unforced, and flows from the grandeur of their subject, because they were influenced by Him Who alone can speak worthily of Himself.'

So much for the Rector of S. Mary Woolnoth; now for the writer of the dark ages:—

'*We look for the Saviour.* Verily, the expectation of the just, the joy of those that wait, is in that blessed hope, and *the glorious Advent of the great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ. And now,* saith the righteous man, *what is my hope? Truly my hope is even in Thee.* And turning to the Lord, *I know,* he saith, *that I shall not be disappointed of my hope, because my substance is before Thee;* because our nature taken from us, and offered up for us, is glorified in Thee; leaving us the hope that *all flesh shall come to Thee;* and that the members may follow the Head, so that the burnt offering may be accomplished. But with fuller trust, because with safer conscience, that man may expect the Lord, who can say, *The substance* of my little possessions *is before Thee, O Lord;* because either by contributing them to Thee, or in despising them for Thee, I have treasured up my talents in heaven, and have laid them down at Thy feet, *knowing that Thou art able to keep that which I have committed* unto Thee; and not only to keep it, but to give me also *an hundred-fold in the present life, and in the world to come eternal life. Blessed are* ye, *the poor in spirit,* who, according to the counsel of the *Wonderful Counsellor, lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven;* lest, if your treasures should remain on earth, your hearts should also rot there. For, saith he, *where thy treasure is, there will thy heart be also.* Therefore let our hearts go after their treasure; let our cogitations be fixed on high; let our expectation be suspended on the Lord, that we may say with the Apostle, *Our conversation is in heaven, from whence also we look for the Saviour.* For *our fathers trusted in Thee,* even all the just from the foundation of the world, *they trusted in Thee, and were not confounded.* And now we have received *Thy loving-kindness in the midst of Thy Temple,* and the band of Thy rejoicing servants sings together, *Blessed is He That cometh in the name of the Lord: I waited patiently for the Lord, and He inclined unto me.*'

Can there be a stronger contrast than between these two styles? The one priest speaks because it is Sunday morning, because the congregation are waiting for him, and because the publication of his sermons may possibly add to his fame or to his conveniences. The other, because his heart is full of his subject,—because in Advent-time he can manifestly think of nothing but the Advent, and therefore out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh. Guarric, indeed, gives us no laboured panegyric on Scripture, nor does he even state, as Newton does, the superiority of the God of Christians over Jupiter. But he is in the heart of his subject in a moment; he seems to quote the Bible because it is his own natural language, because his thoughts have been so accustomed to flow in scripture channels that they will run in no other; and it is sometimes difficult to tell, nor would he perhaps always have known himself, whether he were employing his own words or those of the inspired writings.

But this subject of scriptural allusion is inseparably connected to that of the mystical interpretations with which primitive and mediæval sermons overflow. Those—as is perhaps the case with most of the present generation—who have been taught to look in scripture doctrines for doctrines only, and in scripture facts for facts only, naturally reject with scorn much

of the Biblical knowledge of the middle ages. 'You may have 'the words of Scripture,' they say, 'but where is the sense? 'The meanings elicited are often so childish, often so contrarient, 'always so far-fetched, that the true signification is utterly lost. 'The same method of interpretation may make anything out of 'anything; and the puritan who, preaching against the fashion-'able head-dress of the day, took for his text, "*Top not come* '*down*," was scarcely a caricaturer of earlier mysticism.' Now we have not the least intention of entering on any disquisition as to the limits to which mystical interpretation may lawfully be carried. There can scarcely be a doubt that in some later writers it did overstep all possible bounds of moderation. For example, however true may be the doctrine that the clergy are to teach and the laity to learn, that there is to be an *ecclesia discens* as well as an *ecclesia docens*,—one can scarcely forbear a smile when the statement of this truth is concluded with a—'For it is written, "The oxen were ploughing, and the asses feeding beside them."'

There was much truth, at least as regards the seventeenth century, in the words of the great preacher, Vieyra, who, though he flourished then, may fairly be called the last of the mediæval divines:—

'But do not the preachers of this day preach the Gospel and Holy Scriptures? Then, how can they be said not to preach the word of God? Here is the evil. They preach the words of God, but they do not preach the word of God. The words of God, preached in the sense in which God spake them, are the word of God; but preached in the sense to which we choose to twist them, are not the word of God, and may be the word of the devil. Tell me, preachers, these useless interpretations which you so often bring forward, these meanings which to you appear so clever,—is this the sense in which God spoke? Is this the sense in which the Fathers of the Church understood? Is this the plain grammatical meaning of the words? "At the last came two false witnesses." Yet we find that Christ had truly said the words that they reported. Then why false? Because Christ spoke them in one sense, and they related them in another. Ah, Lord, how many false witnesses rise up against Thee now! How many times I hear Thee made to say that which Thou never didst say! How many times I hear something reported to be Thy word which is only my imagination! for I do not exclude myself from the number of the guilty.'[1]

And, to do Vieyra justice, he could not.

S. Jerome had, indeed, given the same warning long before. 'They disdain to know,' said he, 'what the prophets or the 'Apostles meant; but bring forward inadequate quotations in 'support of their own meaning, and wrest Scripture, repugnant 'though it be, to their private convenience.' In like manner S. Charles Borromeo advises the preacher not to invent new and contorted allegories, but to be content with those already

[1] Sermones, tom. i. p. 70.

taught by the Fathers, and above all things to avoid the ingenious fancies of Origen.

Two things, however, must be borne in mind with respect to this mystical system. In the first place, Scripture itself authorizes it to a certain (and that a very considerable) extent. 'For 'this Agar is Mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jeru-'salem which now is, and is in bondage with her children.' And again, still more remarkably, 'Thou shalt not muzzle the ox 'which treadeth out the corn. Doth GOD take care for oxen, or 'saith He not it *altogether* for our sakes? For our sakes, no 'doubt, this was written:' where the primary signification is declared of no account, and the spiritual is made the principal meaning. But if it be once granted that the system is at all allowable, who can presume to set bounds to its exercise? It is remarkable, as Dr. Pusey observes, that, in Psalms which we, after deep thought, can see to be partially applicable to our Lord, we find S. Augustine declaring, almost as if by intuition, 'This Psalm breathes altogether of Christ.' Surely, however far mediæval mysticism may have been carried, it is, to use the evangelical term, more in accordance with the 'mind of the Spirit,' than that harsh and rigid Canon of Calvin's, which so many of his followers receive and applaud. It is, he taught, unsafe to find a type of Christ anywhere, except where it is pointed out to us in the New Testament. We may see Him, therefore, in the Paschal Lamb, but not in the sacrifice of Isaac; we may find Him in Melchisedec, but not in Joseph: He is represented to us by the Brazen Serpent, but not by the Ark of the Covenant. And evangelical writers on the Bible have not been sparing in their denunciations of the older system. Thus Scott, the so-called commentator, in reply to a question, whether the 'certain poor man,' who, as the Book of Ecclesiastes tells, delivered the City, and yet was not remembered, were intended as a type of Christ, thus expresses himself:—

'I would gladly know by what authority any man, overlooking plain useful instructions, by the help of a warm imagination sets himself to find gospel mysteries in this passage? It would puzzle the most ingenious of these fanciful expositors fairly to accommodate the circumstances of the story to the work of Redemption. Two purposes, indeed, such as they are, may be answered by such interpretation; 1stly, loose professors are encouraged in their vain confidence; 2dly, it is a powerful engine in the hands of vainglorious men, by which to catch the attention and excite the imagination of the injudicious multitude.'

Mediæval preachers, indeed, knew perfectly well that such interpretations *are* powerful engines, as all sermons ought to be. They knew with how much force such a text as, 'But when the morning was now come, Jesus stood on the shore,' speaks to the heart, when the morning is interpreted of the Resurrection, and

the shore, of the harbour of everlasting rest after the waves of this troublesome world; they knew what beauty is thrown round the verse, 'With my staff I passed over this Jordan, and now I am become two bands,' when the Cross, and the River of Death, and the preserved Angels, and restored Man, are typified by it. And if in any instance mediæval preaching pushed these interpretations to extravagance, it is surely better that we should see Christ everywhere, with Cocceius, than that we should see Him nowhere, with Grotius.

It is necessary also to bear in mind the great difference between basing a doctrine on an allegorical interpretation, and merely referring to that interpretation, in its support and illustration. That from the very earliest times we have instances of the first method of quotation no one will deny, whatever opinion may be formed as to the legitimacy of the practice. At Nicæa, the Catholic text was, as all the world knows, 'My heart hath produced a good word.' Afterwards, in the controversies with Semi-Arians and Macedonians, that verse was thought irrefragable, 'By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath of His mouth.' Still later, Jovinian and his fellows were overthrown by the quotation from Ezekiel,—'This gate shall be shut, it shall not be opened, 'and no man shall enter in by it; because the Lord, the God 'of Israel, hath entered in by it, therefore shall it be shut,'—so constantly cited in defence of the perpetual virginity of S. Mary.

But allusions by way of reference stand on a very different footing. A congregation on S. Laurence's day was reminded, in the words of the Book of Deuteronomy, that 'His bedstead was a bedstead of iron.' The ecclesiastic about to preach on the Feast of SS. Peter and Paul took for his text, 'And God made two great lights.' On S. Martin's day a favourite subject was, 'And Jonathan stripped himself of the robe that was upon him, and gave it to David.' Was reference made to the perpetual presence of Christ with His Church?—the passage was adduced, 'The heart of her husband shall safely trust in her, so that he shall have no need of spoil.' Was the hearer warned against the sin of gluttony, as the destroyer of the soul?—he was reminded that Jerusalem was taken by Nabuzaradan, 'Prince of the Cooks.' Nor were puns thought unbefitting in pointing an allusion. On S. Vincent's day the subject of the sermon would be, 'To *Vincent* will I grant to sit with me in my throne.' Sometimes, indeed, the reference is to us rather revolting than edifying. Thus, on S. Laurence's day, the text occurs—the reference is of course to the kind of martyrdom which that saint offered as it were to Christ, and to the fish as the type of every Christian—'And they gave Him a piece of a broiled fish.

And then, after all, though we should remove the whole of these symbolical expositions from mediæval sermons, look at the residuum, that which every one would be glad to say if it entered their minds, and which every one when it is once pointed out to them will wonder that they did not say. How infinitely greater a knowledge of Scripture does it exhibit, how infinitely closer investigation and deeper study does it show, than that of the most famous among our own commentators! The mere outside facts of Scripture, those historical events which we make it our boast that English children are taught, how they are slurred over in the writings of our own authors! To go no further than the 1st chapter of Genesis. There are three remarkable points which, from S. Ambrose till the Reformation, were discussed and re-discussed, but which by modern annotators are altogether unnoticed:—why the second day had no blessing, why the third and sixth days had two blessings, and why, after the statement that God said, 'Let us make man in our image, after our likeness,'—the historical narrative continues, that we were formed in the *image*, but says nothing about the *likeness* of the Creator. Even if we grant that the explanations of these passages are forced and fanciful,—which system shows the greater reverence for the letter of Scripture; that of those who pass over such facts as not worthy of attention, or of those who laboriously, even should it be also unsuccessfully, investigate them?

Such commentators, however, have ere now defended themselves by referring to Lord Bacon's not over-wise dictum—that, as wines made from the first crush of the grape are the purest, so the easiest interpretations of Scripture are the most profitable. The philosopher might have remembered that the liquor which flows from that first crush is not wine at all, but a crude and unwholesome beverage. It cannot be denied that our modern interpreters have abundantly acted on his recommendation.

Thus, the practical observations which take up so large a portion of 'Scott's Commentary' are such as some men would not take the trouble of even thinking, many would not be at the pains of speaking, and—one should have imagined, were not the fact as it is—such as no man would have condescended to write down. Take an example. If ever there was an Old Testament History which evidently contained a deep spiritual meaning, it is that of Leah and Rachel. The two sisters, like Mary and Martha in the New Testament, have sometimes been held to set forth the active and the contemplative life; and there is a sublime passage in S. Augustine (*Contra Faustum*, 22, 52,) based on this idea;—sometimes as the types of earthly and heavenly life; sometimes as the synagogue and the Church—and

the allusions which occur all through the middle ages to this most common symbolism have invested it with no small share of beauty. So Bernard of Cluny:—

'Tunc Jacob Israel et Lia tunc Rachel efficietur:
Tunc Sion atria pulchraque patria perficietur.'

So Adam of S. Victor:—

'Lippam Liam latent multa,
Quibus videns Rachel fulta
Pari nubit fœdere.'

So again, the panegyrist of S. Thomas:—

'Post Agar ludibrium Saræ natus datur;
Post Liam ad libitum Jacob uxoratur.'

But on this history, pregnant as it is with meaning, Scott the Commentator has nothing better to remark than what follows:—

'One cannot but lament to see Jacob cheated into polygamy in so extraordinary a manner, and indeed the malice and artifice of Laban are clearly discernible in the transaction. The Lord, however, so sets one thing against another, that there is less difference in the comparative happiness of mankind than superficial observers imagine; and in the most ordinary circumstances of private life His hand should be acknowledged, especially when he relieves our distresses and answers our prayers.'

Much on this subject may be learnt from the *Concordantiæ Morales* of S. Antony of Padua. This is a collection of texts, arranged under different heads, for the convenience of the preacher, and containing five books. There is scarcely a moral or religious subject which is not thus treated at length. The last book is especially taken up with passages suited to the festivals of the Christian year. Consider the admirable wisdom with which the following texts are selected, under the head that we ought to be solicitous to help forward each other's salvation:—Genesis iv. 9: 'Where is Abel thy brother?' Exodus xxvi. 3: 'The five curtains shall be coupled together, one to another.' Isaiah ii. 3: 'Come ye and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord.' Jeremiah xvi. 16: 'Behold, I will send for many fishers, saith the Lord, and they shall fish them.' S. John i. 45: 'Philip findeth Nathanael.' S. John iv. 28: 'The woman then left her water-pot, and went her way into the city.' Rev. xxii. 17: 'And let him that heareth say, Come.'

These selections are highly valuable, as showing the character of the subjects which the popular preacher of the thirteenth century was in the habit of choosing. The following are for the Feast of S. Andrew. We will not deprive our readers of the opportunity of exercising their ingenuity in the explanation of some of them.

Genesis viii. 20: 'Noah builded an altar unto the LORD; and took of every clean beast, and of every clean fowl, and offered them upon the altar.'

Numbers xii. 3: 'Now the man Moses was very meek, above all the men that were upon the face of the earth.' (The mediæval attribute of S. Andrew. *Andrea pie, sanctorum mitissime*, says the Sarum Hymnal.)

Judges vii. 3: 'Whosoever is fearful and afraid, let him return and depart early from Mount Gilead.'

2 Kings iv. 32: 'And when Elisha came into his house, behold, the child was dead, and laid upon his bed.'

Judith vi. 13: 'They bound Achior, and cast him down, and left him at the foot of the hill, and returned to their lord.'

Job xxiii. 11: 'My foot hath held His steps; His way have I kept, and not declined.'

Job xxxix. 21: 'He paweth in the valley, and rejoiceth in his strength: he goeth forth to meet the armed men.'

Canticles vii. 8: 'I said, I will go up to the palm tree; I will take hold of the boughs thereof.'

Ecclesiasticus xxiv. 16: 'As the turpentine tree I stretched out my branches, and my branches are the branches of honour and grace.'

S. Luke xix. 4: 'And he ran before, and climbed up into a sycamore tree to see Him: for He was to pass that way.'

In addition to which we have the more usual texts from the Epistle and Gospel for the day.

Here is another example, for sermons addressed to Diocesan Synods:—

Genesis xxxi. 38: 'These twenty years have I been with thee; thine ewes and thy she-goats have not cast their young.'

2 Samuel xxiii. 8: 'These be the names of the mighty men whom David had.'

1 Kings xx. 39: 'Keep this man; if by any means he shall be missing, thy life shall be for his life.'

Proverbs xxvii. 23: 'Be thou diligent to know the state of thy flocks, and look well to thy herds.'

Ecclesiasticus x. 2: 'As the judge of the people is himself, so are his officers.'

Ecclesiasticus xxxii. 1: 'If thou be made the master, lift not thyself up, but be among them as one of the rest; take diligent care for them, and so sit down.'

Something of the same kind may be traced in the writings of Bishop Andrewes and his contemporaries, who also afford many instances of a practice so dear to mediæval writers, that of eliciting a prodigious depth of meaning from one comparatively unimportant word. Thus William Austin, one of the most devotional writers, though a layman, of the time of King James the First, has left a sermon on the words, *And Bartholomew*, for S. Bartholomew's day. After noticing, what is perfectly true, that the name Bartholomew never appears in Scripture without being preceded by the copulative particle, he proceeds to dilate on the Christian duty and benefit of mutual help and assistance; a doctrine which is thus entirely evolved from the one word, *And*. The ingenious repartee with which

a preacher of this kind was once met is well known. Having become a candidate for some lectureship, he was required, in his turn, to exhibit his talents in the pulpit; and naturally wishing to make the most of them, he took for his text the word *But.* He thence deduced the truth that no lot is without its cross. Naaman was a mighty man of valour, and honourable, *but*—he was a leper. The five wicked cities were as fruitful as the garden of God; *but*—the men of Sodom were wicked and sinners before the Lord exceedingly. The inhabitants of Ai thought that they had put the Israelites to flight; *but*—they wist not that there were liers in wait behind the city. When our divine returned to the vestry, he was met by the principal trustee of the lectureship with the appropriate observation,—'Sir, it was a most ingenious sermon, and 'we are exceedingly obliged to you for having delivered it; '*but*—you are not the preacher that will do for us.' An undesigned piece of symbolism once lost an Irish divine the mitre. Sheridan, the friend of Dean Swift, was requested by a country clergyman to take his duty for him on the next Sunday. The doctor, then high in favour at Dublin Castle, complied, and preached an old sermon on the words, 'Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof.' It happened that the Sunday in question was the anniversary of the accession of the House of Hanover; and the supposed insult was never forgiven. The story told of Paley, that he proposed as a text for a University sermon when Pitt, then Prime Minister, was expected to be present, 'There is a lad here, which hath five barley loaves and two small fishes,' is well known.

At the same time it will be found that the more recondite texts were generally addressed *ad clerum;* and that sermons preached to parish congregations are almost always based on the Gospel or the Epistle of the day. This custom, in many parts of Europe, acquired almost the force of a law; and a remarkable relic of it still exists in a communion which has preserved much of the husk of the earlier Church,—the Swedish Establishment. Here the preacher is to this day compelled to take his text either from the Epistle or from the Gospel; and so inconvenient has the law been found, that at the present moment, we believe, a commission is sitting for the addition of fresh Epistles and Gospels, not to be used in the Liturgy, but to afford a greater variety of texts to the preacher. Bishop Cosin, who, with all his excellences, would have introduced something of a cast-iron system into ecclesiastical polity, laments in one of his sermons that permission had been given to the clergy to choose their texts from any other portion of pture than those appointed for the day.

It would be curious to learn when it became the established practice in England that a sermon must have a text, and that a text must be taken from Scripture. Neither was a requisite in earlier times. Thus we sometimes find it selected from an Antiphon. Peter of Blois has a sermon on S. Andrew's Day, of which the text is,—*Salve, crux preciosa: suscipe discipulum ejus qui pependit in te; magister meus, Christus.* And this is a very common practice among modern Russian preachers, who frequently hang their sermons on a *troparion* instead of a verse of Scripture. There are innumerable instances in which the sermon begins without any text at all, and some in which the verse of a hymn forms the text. Thus, for example, Peter de Celle preaches from that stanza—

> 'Gloria tibi Domine,
> Qui natus es de Virgine,
> Cum Spiritu Paraclito
> Et nunc, et in perpetuum.'

So Venerable Bede takes his text from the

> 'Felix per omnes festum mundi cardines
> Apostolorum præpollet alacriter,' &c.

Next to the intimate knowledge of Scripture which mediæval writers display, their power of adapting themselves to the wants and requirements of the poor and ignorant is one of their most remarkable characteristics. It was not, we may be sure, without cause that such crowds of peasants flocked to hear men like S. Thomas Aquinas. The power which these great divines possessed of taking nothing for granted as known by their hearers, of explaining even those circumstances which would seem to need no explanation, of describing everything, and leaving nothing to the possibility of a mistake, well deserves to be imitated by us. It is not without deep reason, though at first sight the observation seems absurd, that Gretser, the great German divine, while discussing the question, whether our Lord were nailed to the Cross before or after its elevation, determines on the former; 'because,' says he, 'it is more convenient to the Christian's imagination that it should so have been.' And not only by simplicity and clearness, but by striking stories, homely proverbs, and appropriate similes, did these great men find their way to the hearts of the poor. Thus the worthy Archdeacon of Bath, Peter of Blois, preaching professedly to the people, relates a long allegory, based on the *psychomachia* of Prudentius, in which the contest of Faith with her various opponents is set forth. The whole sermon is a curious example of what was thought suitable for, and (as the phrase goes) *took* with, a village congregation in Somersetshire, about the year 1180. It must have occupied at least two hours in the delivery, a length for which the author apologises in a

short preface. It seems that the sermon made a sensation, and that some friend of the writer requested him to give it a wider circulation by translating it into Latin. 'I shall not be 'astonished,' he says in reply, 'either if you keep it to yourself, 'after reading it, or throw it by, or burn it, or tear it into the 'smallest pieces you can; nor must you be surprised if I have 'transgressed the brevity of an ordinary sermon, since the 'dignity of the Latin language requires that what in the 'vulgar tongue may be spoken shortly and hurriedly, should be 'expressed with greater length and fulness.' Another interesting sermon, of the same writer's, on All Saints Day, is clearly addressed to a poor congregation, and is occupied in pointing out, on the one hand, the blessings of poverty; and, on the other, the danger of the mistake which would confound the poor of this world with the poor in spirit. From another discourse, preached after a Confirmation, we will make some extracts, because it is not uninteresting to read the very words addressed to an English congregation seven hundred years ago, which we might with great profit employ now; and because it is singular to find the lower view of Confirmation, that which refers to the promise renewed rather than to the grace received, brought the most prominently forward. The preacher introduces Satan as pleading against the sinner at the last day:—

'This man renounced in baptism me and all my works and all my pomps; and then, forgetful of his promise, as quickly as he could he surrendered himself to him whom he had renounced, went about his work, and took delight in his vanities. But when he came to a sense of what he had done, he changed his determination for the better. Be it so, that he returned to Thee; be it so that "the wicked forsook his ways and the unrighteous man his thoughts," and went back to Thee, and Thou didst have mercy on him. Be it so: it is manifest that he again altered his resolution for the worse, and the "latter end of that man was worse than the first." I will prove it. Remember, I beseech Thee, that before Thy vicar, before Thine anointed, before Thy minister, he renewed the covenant of baptism, and bound himself by the promise which he again uttered. Here at least he cannot excuse himself on account of age; he cannot assert that he came by compulsion; he cannot pretend insufficiency. He came before Thy minister, of full understanding and not in infancy; he promised voluntarily, and not by over persuasion; he boldly and freely took on his shoulders a burden which he could have borne. What more? In one and the same moment, he departed from Thy minister and forsook his promise: he deceived Thy priest, he deceived Thee, he deceived himself; he cast away Thy light yoke and easy burden, and embraced the ancient slavery of sin: he cast away the garment of innocence, and again took up that which he had left with his Egyptian mistress. And wilt Thou not, O righteous Judge, allow that *he* is a betrayer, who, when he has eaten of Thy bread, has lifted up "his heel against thee?" Was not the hand of him that betrayed Thee with Thee on the table, when this man, who ate the bread of angels, the bread which cometh down from heaven and giveth life to the world, nevertheless cast in his lot with Thine enemies, "walked in the counsel of the ungodly, stood in the way of

sinners; and," which is more wicked yet, yea, which is most wicked of all, glories that he "sat in the seat of the scornful?" Either allow that he is a betrayer, or reject Thine Augustine, who expressly says, that "his sin is as great who betrays Christ to sinful members, as his was, who gave Him up to the Jews that crucified Him."'

And so the good Archdeacon goes on, speaking with a plainness which shows that he knew his way to the hearts of those Somersetshire villagers, as well as how to direct the Church's course in the troubles that followed the martyrdom of S. Thomas of Canterbury.

But of all preachers who knew how to impress a country congregation, Venerable Bede must have been one of the most remarkable. Take up the first book of modern sermons that comes to hand,—such discourses, we mean, as call themselves plain and simple, and are addressed to ignorant labourers: look how in describing the consequences of sin in another world, the preacher speaks so vaguely, generalizes so indistinctly, and employs such difficult expressions, that one may be very sure his hearers must have left the church, if with any impression at all, certainly with one of the vaguest and least practical character. Now listen to Bede, preaching on the torments of hell—(we must, of course, do him the justice to believe that he considered the legend on which he founds his description to be of authority. We quote it for the language only):—

'There were here trees all on fire, and sinners were tormented on those trees; some hanging by the feet, some by the hands, some by the hair, some by the neck, some by the tongue, some by the arm. And again he beheld a burning fiery furnace, with seven fires; and many were punished in it; and there were seven plagues round about the furnace. The first, snow; the second, ice; the third, fire; the fourth, blood; the fifth, serpents; the sixth, lightning; the seventh, stench. And in that furnace were punished the souls of sinners who had not repented in this world; there they are tormented, and each receives according to that he has done. Some weep, some howl, some groan, some burn, and desire to have rest, but find none, because the soul can never die. Truly, brethren, we ought to fear that place in which is everlasting woe, in which is groaning, in which is sadness without joy, in which is abundance of tears on account of the misery of souls. After that he saw a horrible abyss, in which were many diabolical beasts, like fishes in the middle of the sea, which were devouring the souls of sinners. And he beheld also, between heaven and earth, the soul of a sinner which had that day departed from the world, howling in the midst of seven devils; and the angels cried out against it, and said,—Woe to thee, wretched soul! What hast thou done in thy lifetime? Thou hast despised the commandments of God, thou hast wrought no good works, and therefore thou shalt be cast into outer darkness, where shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth. After this, angels, in one moment, carried a soul from the body to heaven, and he heard the voice of a thousand spirits rejoicing on its account, and saying, O happy and most blessed soul! to-day thou shalt be filled with joy, because thy works have been good: and they carried it into the presence of God, Who rendered to it according to its doings.'

One cannot doubt that Bede was, what we know him, from contemporaneous accounts, to have been, a most effective preacher; and not the less so because he always contented himself with making one impression in one sermon. Here we may notice one great point of difference between those ancient and our modern preachers. The former, well knowing that an ignorant congregation is capable of carrying away only one great idea at one time, dwelt on the main subject of their discourse up to the very end. If they had been describing the torments of hell, with the torments of hell they concluded; if they had been speaking of the glories of Paradise, they took care that no after-words should divert the attention of their hearers from those glories. We, for the most part, do just the contrary. We think it necessary to add something at the end of a sermon, lest the auditors should go away with a one-sided idea of truth. If we have been terrifying them by the prospect of God's vengeance, we cannot be content without throwing in something about His mercy as a makeweight. We forget that sermons addressed to the poor must necessarily be treated strongly and coarsely; and so we act much as the painter would, who should finish with the elaboration of a miniature a fresco intended to be looked at from a distance only. We will again quote Vieyra:—

'A sermon ought to have one theme only, and to be of one material only. This is why Christ said that the sower in the parable sowed, not many kinds of seeds, but one. A sower went forth to sow his *seed*,—his *seed*, not his *seeds*. If the labourer were first to sow wheat, and over that rye, and over that millet, and over that barley, what would spring up? A tangled forest, a green confusion. And so it is with sermons of this kind. The Baptist converted many in Judea; but how many subjects did he take? One only: "Prepare ye the way of the Lord:" preparation for the kingdom of Christ. Jonah converted the Ninevites; but on how many themes did he dilate? On one only: "Yet forty days, and Nineveh shall be overthrown:" the subversion of the city. So it is; Jonah in forty days preached but on one subject; and we in one hour preach on forty.'

To the same purpose also speaks Guibert of Nogent in the treatise to which we have before alluded.

'When,' says he, 'the preacher is possessed of great powers of mind, and has an excellent memory for the matter he is about to treat, he should consider the weakness of those who are his hearers, and remember how much better it is that a few things should be heard with pleasure, and retained, than that out of a multitude nothing should be carried away; and should, therefore, not be too long, in order that when he is about to preach again, the people may be willing, and not disgusted auditors.'

Another thing well worthy of attention in mediæval sermons addressed to the poor, is the infinite care with which their writers seem to have avoided difficult expressions, and trains of thought liable to be misunderstood. And this is the more remarkable

because, in their translation from the language in which they were preached to that in which we read them, they necessarily lost much of their simplicity. We constantly find expressions inserted in the Latin which could not have occurred in the original; as, for example, where Peter of Blois, in a discourse which we know to have been preached in the vulgar tongue, says concerning the soul of the sinner, *Vertit se in cœnum, non in cœlum;* a pun which manifestly could not have occurred in English, and which must have been inserted as an afterthought.

In contrast to this care, we will mention two modern anecdotes. One is related by an eminent living prelate, who, with the greatest good humour, is in the habit of telling it as a warning to his clergy to preach plainly. While he was still serving a curacy, he was anxious to try his hand at extempore preaching, and, accordingly, took for his text, 'The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God.' On this subject he dwelt, much to his satisfaction, for the usual time; he proved from the works of creation, from the construction of our own bodies, and from the other usual topics, that there must be a creative power, and that that creative power is God. He came down from the pulpit with the comfortable conviction that he had not done so badly after all. Happening to walk home with a farmer who had attended the service, he was anxious to learn what impression he had produced, and, accordingly, made some observation which led to the point he wished to introduce. 'A very capital sermon you gave us, Mr. B.,' remarked his companion; 'but somehow I can't help thinking there be a God, for all you said.'

The other anecdote was related to us by another prelate of our Church. He happened to be staying in a country village, when a stranger was accidentally called in to preach. His text was, 'There was a man of the Pharisees named Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews: the same came to Jesus by night.' His sermon was very much to the point, so far as educated persons were concerned. But, on the following day, the Bishop happened to inquire of an old woman in the parish, if she had understood, and how she had liked, the discourse. 'Very much indeed,' was her reply; 'and I always *did* hear say that it was by night the fairies danced on Harborough Hill.' So much for the preacher's description of the character of the Pharisees.

The present writer may lay claim to the praise which Dryden bestowed on Milbourne,—that of being the 'fairest of critics,'—by relating a somewhat similar circumstance which happened to—the reviewer's mysterious singular plurality—'ourselves.' We had been preaching on the subject of baptism, and had

tried to explain, in the most popular way we could, the distinction between regeneration and conversion, dwelling particularly on the difference between the *one* baptism and the repeated repentances. We thought, like the excellent prelate to whom we have referred, that we had been particularly intelligible; and, perhaps with some little idea of being praised for our plainness, we afterwards made some observation to the most intelligent auditor in a very ignorant congregation. 'The very best sermon I ever heard preached,' was his remark; 'I had never seen so clearly before that, when we have fallen into sin, we can be baptized again to get out of it.'

Another method by which the old preachers reached the hearts of their poor hearers, was by the introduction of every-day proverbs and household sayings. Thus, Peter of Blois, in preaching on the guardianship of angels, is dwelling on the cause of their love to us. 'It is,' says he, 'for God's 'sake, the richness of whose mercy they see poured around us. 'For no man hath greater love than this, that a man lay down 'his life for his friends. Therefore, they know that He loved 'us, because He gave His life for us. It is a common saying, '"Love me, love my dog" (*Qui me diligit, et canem meum*). 'And would that we *were* dogs, and then we should lick the 'sores of our sins; or, at least, whelps, and then we should eat 'of the crumbs that fall from our Master's table.' So Hrabanus Maurus, the universal scholar of the ninth century, in speaking of the temptation of our Lord. 'Then,' says he, 'was Jesus 'led up into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil. Talk 'of the devil, and he is sure to appear. But how? you will 'say. You have even now mentioned him, and he appears not.' On which the Archbishop proceeds to dwell on the invisible presence and never-failing temptations of Satan; and a very good sermon he hangs on the proverb in question. So again, Guarric of Igniac makes a remarkable use of a proverb in an Advent sermon. 'The Lord,' he says, 'thus speaks by His 'prophet, My people shall hang on My return. It is well and 'properly said; *shall hang*, as it were, between heaven and 'earth. They are neither able to ascend to heavenly things, 'nor willing to descend to earth. The common proverb tells 'us, "It is ill waiting while one is hanging." But I say, it is 'well waiting while one is so hanging. My soul chooses this 'suspension of its own free will, and only desires to hang on 'such a cross until it shall depart from the body.' One more example is the following: Guibert of Nogent, in a Lent sermon, is speaking of the patience necessary to a Christian, that he may bear the cross before he can gain the crown. 'And notice 'this,' he says; 'Christ declares ye have need of patience, that

'after ye have done the will of God, ye might inherit the 'promise. On the contrary, the devil testifies, and says, "A 'bird in the hand is worth two in the bush." But the eggs of 'such birds are like the cockatrice's eggs, whereof the prophet 'makes mention, that bring no advantage, but rather confusion 'and trouble.'

In the same way, mediæval preachers are constantly introducing anecdotes and stories to illustrate any point which may occur. Take an example from a sermon by an unknown mediæval writer, on the sin of pride, and the merit which humility possesses in the eyes of God:—

'It happened on a certain night, in the monastery of Heisterbach, that the precenter began the Antiphon of the Invitatory, and the brother who stood next to him pitched his voice too low in intoning the psalm. Hereenvic, who was then prior, with the other elders carried on the chant on the same note on which it had been begun. Now, there was a certain youth, somewhat wanting in wisdom, who stood at the lower end of the choir; and being indignant that the tone should be pitched so low, he exalted his voice about five notes above the rest. His superiors resisted, but he would not yield, and some who were on the opposite side of the choir assisted him; whence, on account of the scandal and discord, the elders gave way. Presently, the abbat beheld the devil gliding away from the monk who had thus won the day into the opposite choir, and there mingling with the brethren who had assisted him. Whence we gather that more pleasing to God is a tone pitched too low, if it be accompanied with devotion of heart, than voices arrogantly exalted to the sky.'

S. Aelred of Rievaulx, whom one pictures as a kind, white-haired old man, surrounded by monks in the first fervour of their devotion, is very fond of relating such stories. Here is one. 'I am acquainted,' says he, 'with a convent under the direction of the holy father Gilbert,'—that is, S. Gilbert of Sempringham,—'in which there was, and there may be still, a certain virgin distinguished for sanctity of life.' He proceeds to relate the visions which this nun reported to her sisters, and goes on: 'There was, in the same convent, a woman of 'great discretion, who, knowing that we are not to trust every 'spirit, but to try the spirits whether they be of God, believed 'that all these appearances were to be attributed to disease, or 'to some illusion of the fancy.' The worthy Abbat next tells how this nun investigated the subject, and was at length convinced of her want of faith: 'a narration,' he observes, 'which 'may not be uselessly inserted as an illustration of the advan-'tage which faith possesses over reason.'

It would be endless to refer to all the stories which the sermons of Bede contain, whose great delight it seems to have been to find some anecdote which would suit his subject and his auditors, and to dwell on hardly anything else. It is worth noting, that the French preachers of the middle ages, such as

S. Bernard, S. Fulbert of Chartres, S. Hildebert of Tours, Marbod of Rheims, appear to have been far less given to this kind of narrations than their English and German brethren. Again; S. Antony of Padua, the most popular, perhaps, of all preachers who ever lived, has very little of the kind; but his sermons are remarkable for the profuse illustrations they receive from the occupations and trades of those whom he is addressing. Here are some examples, in which he accommodates natural history, or, at least, that which he considered such, to his own purposes. Exhorting to repentance in Lent, he says:—

'Natural historians tell us that the smaller bees are the better workers; they have subtle wings, and their colour is black; but the handsomer bees are of the number of those who do nothing. The small bees are penitents, who are little in their own eyes, and are always employed about some work, lest the devil should come and find their house empty and idle. They also have subtle wings, which are contempt of the world, and love of the heavenly kingdom; by which elevating themselves from this earth, they more subtilly contemplate the glory of God. They are also of a dark colour, whence in the first of Canticles the penitent soul saith, "I am black, but comely."'

One can imagine the bee-keepers of a part of Italy famous for its honey, particularly edified by a comparison of this kind. S. Antony is fond of similes drawn from bees. Here is another, from the sermon on the third Sunday after Trinity:—

'Penitents ought to do as the bees, who, when their king flies from the hive, fly with him, and crowd closely round him,—he in the middle, and they on every side; and when the king can fly no longer, the company of bees carries him; and if he dies, they all die together with him. Christ, our King, flew to us from the hive, that is to say, from the bosom of the Father, whom we ought to follow like good bees, and to fly with Him, and to place Him, that is, His faith, in the midst of us, that is, in our hearts. And if any one of His members shall have fallen into sin, we ought to support and to bear him up, and to die with Christ crucified and dying, crucifying our own flesh, with its affections and lusts.'

And this comparison of the Apostles to ichneumons is rather amusing:—

'There is a certain little serpent which rolls itself in the mud, and thus enters the mouth of the sleeping crocodile, who wakes up, and swallows it down; on which it eats through his entrails, and comes out through his side. Thus the Apostles, rolled as it were in the mud of poverty and humility, leapt boldly into the mouths of tyrants, and openly contradicted their words of unbelief, and were thus devoured by death. Nevertheless, these tyrants themselves were thus slain, and those Apostles came forth alive from them, when their death redounded to the augmentation of the faith, and to the honour of Christ.'

Vieyra, the last of mediæval preachers, dearly loves to introduce an anecdote. The first of those we will quote has to do with our own country:—

'Let me tell you what happened to me when I was in England. There went with me two Portuguese, who on a Sunday set themselves to play at

dice at the inn. In comes the host, much disturbed, and well-nigh out of his senses; "And," says he, "what, gentlemen! do you wish them to burn down my house?" "To burn down your house! and why?" "Because this is a game which can be heard out of doors; and if the magistrates knew of it, I should be a lost man." So the landlord said, and so it would have been. And, to make you wonder the more, the city or town was Dover, a maritime port, where all the inhabitants, without one single exception, are heretics. O shame of us, who pride ourselves so much on the name of Catholics! If in a land of heretics it is sacrilege to play at dice on an ordinary Sunday, what ought it to be to play at such games in Holy Week, in a land where the cross and the image of Christ are adored, and the mysteries of His death are celebrated?'

Here is another story related by the same preacher. The sermon, we should say, was delivered at Maranhão, in Brazil:—

'As I was sailing from here to Parà, I saw a vast quantity of fish, of a kind which I had never before observed, leaping up every now and then from the water. They told me that the Portuguese sailors called them *Four-eyes*. I wished, therefore, to investigate for myself the reason of this name, and I found that in real truth they have four eyes, each perfect and entire. Give thanks to God, I said, and praise the liberality of His divine providence; for to eagles, which are the lynxes of the air, and to lynxes, which are the eagles of the earth, He has given but two, and to you, little fish, he has given four. But I soon found something else more worthy of wonder in the circumstance, and in the place. So many instruments of vision in a worm of the sea, on the very shores of those vast lands where God has permitted, for so many ages, that so many thousands of heathen should be living in blindness. Oh! how deep and incomprehensible are the reasons of God, and how profound is the abyss of His judgments!'

And here is yet another example. He is preaching on the text, 'Ye know not what ye ask.' After explaining the text, 'Ask, and it shall be given you,' he continues:—

'It is better to ask, and to be refused with Paul, than to ask, and to be heard with Satan. How many lost souls are there now in hell, who are bitterly lamenting that their temporal petitions were granted! How many predestinated ones are there in heaven, who are rendering thanks to God that He refused to hear them on earth! Let a saint, who has preached in this same pulpit, bear witness to this same thing. There was in India a nobleman, intimately acquainted with S. Francis Xavier, who had a request to make to Don João the Third. He therefore asked the saint to furnish him with a letter to his companion, Simon Rodriguez, who was tutor to the prince, and high in favour with the king. S. Francis accordingly wrote, and this was the tenour of his letter:—Don Such-an-one is an excellent friend to myself and to the company. He has a petition to lay before the king. I adjure your reverence, by the obligations which we owe to this nobleman, that you will use your utmost endeavours in causing him to fail in his object, for I have observed that he who succeeds in getting on well in India, succeeds also in getting on well towards hell. And so it is still,' as he finely continues, 'with us as it was with him. Oh how many candidates for the Left Hand; oh how many petitioners for eternal damnation are there in all the courts of Christendom; men who know not what they say, nor for what they are pleading! Therefore it is that we read of the Spirit interceding for us with groanings which cannot be uttered. Woe for thee, blinded man, for thou knowest not the danger into which thou art rushing. Woe for thee, who art seeking such a government,

such a seat in such a council, such an office in such a colony. Thou art longing for Brazil; to Brazil thou wilt go, and ruin thy salvation: thou art petitioning for Angola; to Angola thou wilt be sent, and wilt damn thyself: thou art longing for India; thou wilt pass the Cape of Good Hope, and so lose all hope of eternal felicity.'

The introduction of stories into sermons naturally leads to the consideration of those who have employed ludicrous as well as serious means of fixing the attention of their auditors. It would seem that the most celebrated popular preachers have, in all countries and in all ages, felt a tendency to excite laughter, in its turn, as well as other emotions. From the cause we have mentioned above, it is not easy to speak with certainty of S. Antony of Padua; but, judging from the skeletons of his discourses, he, in his laborious missions through the north of Italy, was no exception to the rule. S. Robert of Arbrissel, who, in a most corrupt and barbarous age, was the apostle of Central France, gave way to what some might be disposed to call downright buffoonery. Peter of Celles, the most popular preacher in the same country towards the end of the twelfth century, has frequent turns that must have excited, and must have been intended to excite, a smile. S. Thomas of Villanova, in the sixteenth century, sometimes pursued a similar course. In the great Portuguese reform of the same century, the celebrated preachers—whom, perhaps, as popular haranguers, the Church has never seen equalled—Simon Rodriguez, Ignacio Martinz, and others, were noted for the same disposition. In our own country, Bishop Andrewes has passages which cannot be read, and could scarcely have been heard, without a smile. The case was the same with those who, if the producing a great effect constitutes a great preacher, certainly deserve that name, the Methodist missionaries of the eighteenth century,—John Wesley himself, Whitfield, Cennick, and others. Here, as might be expected, unrestrained by the discipline of the preachers whom we have before named, they frequently became little better than buffoons; as was the case also with Rowland Hill, and, still more coarsely, with Berridge; both, nevertheless, men possessing great power in addressing a popular audience. It would not be difficult to match, among the many puns of the mediæval pulpit, that sentence of Rowland Hill, in preaching at Wapping, which, notwithstanding all its vulgarity, is said to have produced a startling effect:—'Who can dare to despair of 'the mercy of God, when it can extend itself to heinous sin-'ners, to great sinners, to mighty sinners, yea, and to *Wapping* 'sinners?' A pun of even a more curious nature was introduced, if we remember right, by S. Ivo of Chartres, when preaching at a monastery very much infested with dissensions nd quarrels, of which the abbat was the principal cause. 'My

'brethren,' said the bishop, 'if it is the part of a Christian 'to imitate God, you are very much wanting to your duty 'here. Of God it is written, *Pater noster quies in cœlis*, but 'you have to say, *Pater noster inquies in terris*.' We are not now speaking of such plays upon words as were fashionable in the pulpits of Charles the Second's time, and in which South and Echard so largely indulged,—things intended rather to display the wit of the writer, than to promote the edification of the hearer; but of witticisms introduced with the honest purpose of doing good, and on the principle of becoming all things to all men. Under this head fall such ingenious contrivances as that of the Spanish bishop, who, having to preach before a crowded and fashionable auditory, perceived, on mounting the pulpit, so drowsy an aspect in his congregation, that there was little hope of his making any impression. Looking, therefore, to that part of the church in which sat the authorities of the Inquisition, he began thus:—'I deny, and, whatever the Catholic 'Church may say, I shall always deny, that in the One, self-'existent God, there are three Persons, Father, Son, and 'Holy Ghost.' He paused, and, of course, attention was instantly aroused. The bishop of this place looked at the archbishop of that, the officials of the Inquisition turned their heads towards each other, some of the grandees arose, as if about to leave the church, when the preacher quietly continued; 'Thus, my brethren, speaks the Arian, thus speaks the Sabel-'lian; but we, who have been built upon the foundation of the 'apostles and prophets—' and so forth. One of Sterne's sermons begins in the same offensive way. A story is related of a popular dissenting preacher in Wales, who, finding that he had for some time been addressing his congregation to very little purpose, ascended the pulpit one Sunday morning, and, looking around him, said, 'My brethren, I should like to ask 'you a question, which you cannot answer, nor I neither. My 'brethren, what shall it profit a man, if he gain the whole 'world, and lose his own soul?' Saying which, he left the pulpit and the church. This is exactly the thing which some of the more eccentric of mediæval preachers would have done; such, for example, as in Italy, Jacobus de Benedictis, whose familiar appellation of *Jacopone* reveals something of his character; and, to go to a different part of the world, Basil, surnamed *Sorodevie*, that is, mad (for Christ's sake), at Moscow. If there were ever any one who understood how to move and to lead a popular audience, it was Hugh Latimer; and every one knows that his sermons abound with the broadest farce, and teem with expressions which we could not for a moment venture to transfer to our pages. We are, let it be

remembered, neither defending, nor yet condemning, the practices of which we have been speaking; all we say is, that they have been used by the preachers who have been most efficacious, either for good or for evil. Neither can there be any doubt, that English priests, generally, have so reverent a fear of degrading the dignity of the Establishment, of getting off their stilts, of remembering that, after all, they are men speaking to men, of teaching religion as if they really believed in it, that a few examples of an opposite extreme (granting it an extreme) may not have been without their use.

We will take another instance from Vieyra, whom we regard as the more valuable writer, because, while as to time he stands on the debateable ground betwixt the mediæval age and our own, he unites (the reader who is not acquainted with his works may think it impossible) much of the character of S. Jerome on the one hand, and Swift on the other. In occasional turns of thought and collocation of words, Andrewes comes nearer to him than any other English writer; but if Andrewes possesses his piety and his learning, he has not half his wit, nor the tenth part of his eloquence. One of the most curious sermons ever preached, was that which he delivered at Maranhão, a few days before embarking for Portugal on business connected with the missions in Brazil. The whole of that province, and the capital in particular, had sunk into such a frightful state of immorality as, perhaps, was never equalled in any professedly Christian country. Vieyra had crowded audiences, but his sermons, so far as a practical result was concerned, were entirely thrown away. The conceit which runs through the last is about as odd an one as it would be possible to find.

It was S. Antony's day, and the Church of S. Luiz was close to the sea. 'I have long thought,' said the preacher, 'that 'on the festivals of saints, it is better to preach *like* them, than 'to preach *of* them. S. Antony addressed himself to the fishes, 'and so shall I. The church is so near to the sea that they can 'hear me. And, at all events, I shall have two good qualities 'in my auditors—they can hear, and they cannot answer. And 'if,' he continues with bitter irony, 'it be said that fishes are a 'race who cannot be converted and saved, a preacher in Maran-'hão must be so much accustomed to that circumstance that it 'can affect him but little. Therefore, fishes and brethren, I 'now address myself to you.' He divides his sermon into two parts; the first, containing the praise; the second, the blame of his auditors; every circumstance being selected so as to reflect in the most biting manner on the inhabitants of the city. 'The 'first thing,' he says, 'which does not edify me, fishes, in your

'conduct, is, that you devour one another. I confess that you 'have your excuse in the actions of men. Let a man be in trouble, 'the solicitor devours him, the solicitor's clerk devours him, so 'does the notary, so does the sheriff, so does the advocate, so 'does the commissioner, so does the judge; he is devoured before 'he is sentenced. If a man dies, he is devoured by his heirs, 'by his creditors, by his legatees, by the commissioners of 'orphans, by the lawyer, by the physician that helped to kill 'him, by the grave-digger, by the bell-ringer, and by the priest 'that sings the service; the poor man is not yet in his grave, 'and he is already devoured.' Thus he proceeds; and in like manner, while lecturing the fishes for their folly in being taken by a hook, he does not forget to justify them by the hook which the spiritual enemy of man baits for his soul, and by the eagerness with which it is swallowed. Maranhão, in the course of a few years, became a reformed town, but whether the sermon to the fishes were the cause of its reformation, may, perhaps, reasonably be doubted.

It is now time to turn to the third distinguishing feature of mediæval sermons, on which we must dwell a little more at length.

Every one who has studied the ritual and the calendar of the Church, must have speedily convinced himself that its whole aim and design is to be dramatic. It is not the mere reciter of events which happened centuries ago, nor their expounder, nor, as the Puritans would have said, their *improver;* it sets them forth before the eyes of man as if they were now happening; as if they were scenes in which we ourselves were taking a part; as if they were events occurring in our own times, and in which we bore a living interest. The Church would not represent to us the cycle of events in our Lord's life and death, as if they had occurred once for all eighteen centuries ago; but would have us regard them as if they happened again and again, every year, and were occurrences to which we should look forward rather than look back. This characteristic remains very strongly impressed on our own Prayer-book; where, before each recurring festival, we pray in some sort that the event may happen, as a future thing, which we are really commemorating as a past occurrence. Thus, for example, on the Sunday after Ascension, the Church, as if forgetful that the day of Pentecost is really past, prays, in the very same words that the Apostles might have used during the actual ten days which succeeded our Lord's ascension, 'We beseech Thee, leave us not comfortless; but 'send to us Thine Holy Ghost to comfort us, and exalt us unto 'the same place whither our Saviour Christ has gone before.' In the Prayer-books of Protestant Europe this dramatic treat-

ment of the subject is almost universally lost; and it must be confessed that, in one or two instances, our own collects have been, in like manner, rendered tame and prosaic. Never so strikingly as in that for the Fourth Sunday in Advent. The ancient Church, directing her prayer to God the Son, besought Him to appear and to be born for her sake: 'O Lord, raise up, 'we pray Thee, Thy power, and come among us, and with 'great might succour us.' We have utterly destroyed the point of the collect by addressing it to the Father, and concluding it, 'through the satisfaction of Thy Son, our Lord.'

What is true, then, of the ritual and office-books of the mediæval Church, is equally true of the sermons which formed a part of it. Here, also, the events which the Church was setting before her children were spoken of as present, or as future; the hearers were not called on, as so often now, to remember that the Church sets before them this, or that the Church would have them to remember that; but whatever it might be, feast or fast, season of joy or season of sorrow, they were taught to feel that the sorrow or the joy was, and ought to be, as real a matter to them, as to those to whom the event had actually first occurred. Open any sermon of that age, and see how the preacher speaks of the subject of the festival, as of something then occurring. Thus it is, for example, that Guarric, Abbat of Igniac, begins a sermon in Advent: 'Our King 'is coming; let us go to meet our Saviour. Well saith Solo- 'mon, "As cold waters to a thirsty soul, so is good news from a 'far country." Good news, indeed, which proclaims the advent 'of a Redeemer, the reconciliation of the world, the good 'things of the life to come.' There is here no such exordium as we now have; a call to keep in mind the coming of the Saviour, once in great humility, hereafter in great majesty. The preacher plunges his hearers at once into the realization of the fact which the Church commemorates, and announces as good tidings to his audience the same news which so many centuries before had been proclaimed in Bethlehem.

Let us try another discourse of the same Abbat; we will take one on Christmas-day: 'Unto us a Child is born, unto us 'a Son is given. And thus it is that we know Him to be born, 'because He is given. For His birth would avail us nothing, 'unless He were also our own; and He would in vain be made 'the Son of Man, unless it were given to us to become the sons 'of God. Behold, how Jesus is offered to us; hasten to meet 'Him; stretch forth your hands, make ready your affections, 'prove your devotion by acts as well as words.'

Now compare this with the opening of modern sermons on the same subject. Thus it is that Bishop Horsley commences a

Christmas sermon: 'This forty-fifth Psalm has, for many ages, 'made a stated part of the public service of the Church, on this 'anniversary festival of our blessed Lord's Nativity. With 'God's assistance, I purpose to explain to you its application, 'both in the general subject, and in each particular part, to this 'great occasion, which will afford both seasonable and edifying 'matter of discourse.' With Bishop Horsley, then, the Nativity is regarded as an event which occurred many centuries ago, in order that it might be 'improved' and made matter of edifying discourse now; with Abbat Guarric it is a present reality; as present to himself as to the shepherds to whom the angels first announced the glad tidings of great joy which should be to all people. We turn to another sermon on the same subject, and there we find the mediæval author expressly disclaiming the system of the modern divine. 'Ye have come together, 'brethren, to hear the word of God. But God has provided 'some better thing for you. To-day ye shall not only hear, but 'ye shall also see that Word, if ye will but go with me to Beth-'lehem and behold this thing which the Lord hath told and hath 'manifested to us. For God knoweth that the senses of 'men are incapable of things invisible, and hardly to be taught 'things celestial, and are not without difficulty to be persuaded 'to believe, unless the thing which they are exhorted to believe be 'visibly presented to their senses.' But we, so far from remembering this difficulty of faith, do all that in us lies to render it yet harder. We studiously inculcate the fact that the event of which we are preaching is a history of the past, not an action of the present.

It is curious to observe how the mediæval system is by degrees softened and tamed down into the present. The divines of the early part of the seventeenth century have retained much of the reality and effectiveness of earlier times. Thus it is that Bishop Cosin begins a sermon on the Epiphany: 'We are still at the 'feast of Christmas, and this is the last and great day of the 'feast, as S. John said of another. A feast of joy it has been 'all this while, but this day was given us that our joy might be 'full.' So Bishop Andrewes: 'Christ was born, is true any 'day; but this day Christ was born, never but to-day only. 'For of no day in the year can it be said, *hodie natus*, but of 'this. By which word the Holy Ghost may seem to have 'marked it out and made it the peculiar text of the day.' Or again: 'Here is joy, joy at a sight, at the sight of a day, and 'that day Christ's. It is Christ that calleth it here *diem* '*Meum, His day;* and no day so properly His, as His birthday. 'So the text comes full upon the day.' These beginnings, if not reaching the full realization of the festival which we find in

earlier writers, are, at least, incomparably superior to the eighteenth century system of exordium. We sink a little towards it in Dr. Donne. Thus he begins a Christmas sermon: 'It hath 'been suspiciously doubted, and more than that, freely disputed, 'and more than that too, absolutely denied, that Christ was 'born the five-and-twentieth of December; that this is Christ-'mas Day; yet, for all these doubts, and disputations, and 'denials, we forbear not, with the whole Church of God, con-'stantly and confidently to keep this for His day.' And so, by degrees, we come down to the ordinary and common-place method of opening: 'The words which I have read you form a part of the Lesson which the Church,' &c. &c.

Let us try a Passion sermon or two, and see how the different schools of divines treat it. Thus it is that Peter de Celles commences one: 'Behold, beloved brethren, Jesus Christ is being 'led before your eyes to be put to death; what will ye say, or 'what will ye do? Behold, there is none of all His friends to 'console Him; all have forsaken Him and fled. Thou, O Jesu, 'alone for us, yet without us, bearest the burden and heat of the 'day, bearest the crown of thorns, bearest the Cross, bearest Thy 'Blood within the veil of the sanctuary, bearest our sins in Thy 'Body on the Tree of the Cross, bearest the fire and the wood, 'that the fire of Thy Passion may consume the wood of our sins.' Or again: 'We have been following the footsteps of Christ, 'beloved brethren, and have now come to His Passion. God 'grant that, not even in His Passion departing from Him, we 'may wait with Peter to see the end, so that without end we 'may enjoy fellowship with Him. Look, therefore, good 'Christian, at the steps in which He set His feet, and which 'are marked with His Blood, so that thy foot may also be dyed 'in the Blood of the Lamb.' Or take another instance, and hear S. Fulbert of Chartres, in one of his Passion sermons: 'Our Lord Jesus Christ, the Great Physician, is now pre-'paring the medicine that is to be the salvation of our souls. 'Wherefore, Christian brethren, it behoves us to receive that 'which He is now mixing and is now giving. He reaches forth 'the cup of our salvation, and we must stretch forth our hands 'and receive it.'

Look, now, to our own earlier divines. Bishop Andrewes, preaching on the verse, 'Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by?' begins: 'At the very hearing or reading of which there 'is none but will presently conceive it is the voice of a party in 'great extremity. In great extremity two ways; first, in such 'distress as never was any, if ever there was sorrow like my 'sorrow; and then, in that distress, having none to regard him, '"Is it nothing to you?"' Bishop Wilson degenerates into

this commencement: 'Every one of the Apostles and Evan-
'gelists who have written our Lord's Life, have given us a very
'particular account of the manner of His evil treatment, His
'sufferings, and His death. Now these are all read in the daily
'service of this week, as full of instruction, and proper to pre-
'pare us for the Blessed Sacrament, appointed to be adminis-
'tered on Sunday next.' (Imagine Easter Day being principally distinguished as the Sunday on which the Blessed Sacrament was appointed to be administered!) 'Whereby we learn what
'our Lord suffered in order to obtain our pardon, and to restore
'us to the grace and mercy of an offended God.' And at last we come down to such a kind of opening as is that of Joseph Milner: 'The words which I have now read to you contain
'the portion of Scripture appointed by our Church for the
'Epistle on Easter Day. And, perhaps, there is not a portion
'of the Word of God more suitably adapted to the occasion of
'that festival; so deeply and so powerfully does it represent to
'us the right use and proper improvement of our Lord's Resur-
'rection. This great event is of vast importance.' Or take the following from Paley: 'The salvation of mankind, and most par-
'ticularly in so far as the death and passion of our Lord Jesus
'Christ are concerned in it, and whereby He comes to be called
'our Saviour and our Redeemer, ever has been, and ever must
'be, a most interesting subject to all serious minds.'

But bad and shocking to every right feeling as is such an exordium, the method of treating the subject which was prevalent in the last century was, by many degrees, worse. Nor is it quite obsolete among us now. We were once spending a Sunday in Lent in a country parish, where the clergyman was of the old school, and not a bad specimen of it. In the morning he requested us to preach, with a special injunction to be as plain and simple as possible, 'because,' said he, 'my people are very ignorant, and require the most elementary teaching.' Accordingly, we endeavoured to comply with his wishes, and hoped that, in some degree, we had succeeded. 'It was not so bad,' said our friend, as we walked home from church, 'but still
'not quite so plain as I could have wished. If you will listen
'to me in the afternoon, I will endeavour to show you the way
'in which I think that such a congregation ought to be ad-
'dressed.' After such an invitation, when the worthy rector ascended the pulpit, we were—as the saying is—all attention, and heard him begin, nearly word for word, in the following manner: 'To those who will consider the harmony which
'reigns in the various accounts dictated by inspiration of
'Christ's Passion, confirmed as those accounts are by the ante-
'cedent testimonies of Prophets on the one hand, and by the

'concurrent testimonies of the Epistles on the other, it will 'appear in the highest degree probable, that our Blessed Lord 'was not an impostor, but was, in reality, what He gave Him-'self out to be, the Son of God.'

Now there can be no doubt that there was some excuse for this style of preaching in the last century. When the state of religious, or rather of irreligious, feeling was such that a divine, by no means disposed to take a gloomy view of things, could say, 'It seems to be now generally assumed by mankind that 'the Christian religion is an imposition which it was left to this 'age to expose,' it might be necessary, even on the highest festival, to say something in proof of the fact before anything was added of a more edifying nature. He that cometh to God must believe that He is, before he can believe anything further with regard to His doings. And so in a fashionable congregation, as it was a hundred years ago, when Archbishop Potter, or Bishop Lavington, or Archdeacon Paley, or Dr. Jortin was to preach, when the pews of the then new church of S. George's, Bloomsbury, or the still aristocratic place of worship at S. Martin's-in-the-Fields, were crowded to excess, and ladies were obliged to slide their hoops over one shoulder in order to make room, just at the time when Lord Chesterfield was going out of fashion, and Dr. Blair was coming in, it might be necessary to prove to the worshippers on an Easter-day, or a Whit-Sunday, that the Resurrection was not altogether incredible, and that the Descent of the Holy Ghost was within the bounds of possibility. For we must never forget that, however lowering and debasing was this constant struggle against infidelity, however much it might be impossible to touch pitch without being defiled, (so that Douglas, the defender of scripture miracles, based his argument on a foundation which destroyed all others, and even Leslie's celebrated criterion of their truth defends only one not recorded in the Bible, still the work which the Church of England then had to do, to defend revelation, was done, and was done effectually. If we compare the state of the French and English Churches at the beginning and at the conclusion of the eighteenth century, we shall find that with all her great preachers, her Massillons, and her Bossuets, and her Bourdaloues, the former failed, where the latter, through the mercy of God, succeeded. But that what the miserable condition of the last century rendered necessary should be carried on by a dry tradition into this,—that every festival should be made a lesson in evidences, and seasons of the highest joy ushered in by a decoction of Paley or Lardner, is a disgrace from which we ought more thoroughly to have freed ourselves than is, at present, the case.

We have said something of the subjects, and of the manner of

treating these subjects, which occupy mediæval sermons and our own. Let us now turn our attention to the order in which, in both instances, the parts of a sermon follow each other.

One would think, to read some of the essays written on the subject, that the construction of a sermon was like a law of the Medes and Persians. Look at Mr. Simeon's one-and-twenty tedious volumes of 'Horæ Homileticæ.' The worthy man evidently considered this the greatest system of divinity which English theology had ever produced. And of what does it consist? Of several thousand sermons treated exactly in the same ways, in obedience to precisely the same laws, and of much about the same length. Claude's essay had laid down certain rules, and Simeon's discourses were their exemplification. The laws were as invariable for the pulpit as was Dr. Watts's recipe for a prayer:—

> 'Call upon God: adore: confess:
> Petition: plead: and then declare
> You are the Lord's: give thanks and bless:
> And let Amen conclude the prayer.'

In like manner Mr. Simeon's type of sermons may be very easily described. The preacher opens with a short view of the circumstances under which the text was spoken. This is a very convenient exordium, because it fills two or three pages with but little trouble. The clergyman has only to put scripture language into his own, and he is fairly launched in his sermon without any effort. Another almost equally easy method of opening is found in drawing a contrast between the person or thing of which the passage in hand speaks and that to which the writer may wish to allude. And it has this special advantage; that if he is unlucky in finding much likeness between the two, he is sure to discover a good deal of *un*likeness, and either treatment will supply a good number of words. Then, as every one knows, come the heads,—a most important part in this style of discourse. Taking Mr. Simeon as a pattern, we shall find that they cannot be less than two nor more than four; though, indeed, there are not wanting those who have greatly extravagated beyond the superior limit, as the Puritan divine's 'And now, to be brief, I would observe eighteenthly, that—' so and so, may suffice to prove. Then come all the minutiæ of subdivisions, and under-subdivisions, (little heads, as the charity children call them,) all set forth, when the aforesaid discourses come to be printed, in corresponding variations of type. Thus, we have first of all a noble looking Roman numeral, in this manner, I. Next to this will come a more modest 1. The preacher's subject ramifies; in order to keep his skeins clear, he takes refuge in a (1). Again they become entangled, and this

time he betakes himself to a [1]. The congregation admire the scriptural knowledge and the logical depth of their divine; and thus encouraged, he proceeds to a still more minute handling of his subject, and gets down to a *Firstly*. We remember being condemned, when a child, to read day after day the Commentary of Matthew Henry, who, above all other writers, delights in thus multiplying subdivisions. And we well recollect that the single point of interest which his lucubrations afforded us, arose from the mental discussion of a philosophical question connected with them. Suppose, we argued, that the writer wished, after the last subdivision to which we have referred, to divide his topic again, in what kind of type would that division be expressed? So much for the heads.

And then comes the application; varied, it may be, in words, but pretty much the same in meaning. The preacher first addresses 'the unregenerate,' and next 'the regenerate;' or, firstly, the 'unconverted,' and secondly, the 'converted;' unless, indeed, he should prefer to imitate the Irish clergyman, who, on occasion of some state fast, addressed himself, in the first place, to those who evinced their respect to constituted authorities by attending church on that day, and, in the next place, to those who showed their disrespect to the government by staying away.

Thus, we think, we have given a fair view of a Claudian or Simeonian sermon, the great difficulty in which seems to be the drawing to an end. The servant's excuse is no caricature, (as those who have sat under such discourses can well testify,) who, when blamed for bringing the carriage to the door of a fashionable chapel in London twenty minutes before the sermon was over, defended himself by the assertion that he had waited until he had heard the preacher say at short intervals, 'Lastly,' 'Finally,' 'Not to be tedious,' 'In fine,' 'And to conclude,' and had then ventured to think that he might come away.

Now let us see in what way it was that the older writers managed their divisions. To make ourselves more intelligible, we will take the liberty of applying a passage in a sermon of John Newton's to the matter in hand. Preaching against the Oratorio of the 'Messiah,' he says—

'I represent to myself a number of persons of various characters involved in one common charge of high treason. There is not the least doubt of their guilt being fully proved, and that nothing but a pardon can preserve them from punishment. Entirely regardless of their danger, they are wholly taken up with contriving methods of amusing themselves. Among other resources, they call in the assistance of music; and amidst a great variety of subjects in this way, they are particularly pleased with one. They choose to make the solemnities of their impending trial the groundwork of a musical entertainment. The king, however, undesired by them,

sends them a gracious message, and, in a way which he condescends to prescribe, he offers them a free and a full pardon. But, instead of taking a single step towards a compliance with his goodness, they set this message likewise to music, and it is sung for their diversion.'

With a great deal more truth one might ask a question which would have occasioned the worthy Rector of S. Mary Woolnoth some little surprise. Is it possible that they, knowing, or, at least, pretending to know, more than others, the office of a Christian priest in reference to men under such a condemnation as that to which the extract refers,—is it possible that they could desire to cramp down his message here, to pare it off there, to elongate or to abbreviate it as if its value depended on its inches, to split it up into so many bundles of facts, to make an introduction and an application essential points, instead of leaving him to speak out of the fulness of his heart, to be interesting in his own way, and to give GOD'S message in as natural a manner as he would deliver one of his own? The wonder is, that so many men, whom one cannot doubt to be really in earnest, should sit down Saturday after Saturday to compound from the 'Horæ Homileticæ' the discourse which they propose to inflict next day on their parishioners. The flatness, and tameness, and insipidity of such a sermon, let its source be eloquence and fervour itself, could hardly be paralleled. Its issue must be of the same kind with the *thorough-paced doctrine* of Bishop Sprat. When that honest man, but miserable divine and poet, was examined before the Privy Council on the charge of complicity with Bishop Atterbury's so-called plot, a paper was taken from his person and considered highly suspicious by the lawyers, which contained these words: 'Doctor Burgess—thorough-paced doctrine.' 'If I must explain,' said he, when pressed as to the meaning of these mysterious symbols, 'the facts are 'these. I am ashamed to say that once, when a young man, I had 'the curiosity to attend Dr. Burgess's then celebrated meeting-'house. Speaking of thorough-paced doctrine, he said that he 'would define it for the benefit of his hearers; "it is that doc-'trine," he continued, "which goes in at one ear, and goes out 'of the other."' And in Dr. Burgess's sense we may safely affirm the sermons of which we have been speaking to be peculiarly thorough-paced.

It is remarkable in how few sermons, either of the early or the middle ages, is there any division at all analogous to that of modern Heads. In S. Ambrose or S. Augustine such a thing is scarcely to be found. In the seventh and eighth centuries, such writers as S. Isidore and the French school of divines sometimes divided their discourses in a more set or formal manner; but no great preacher appears to have been much given to the system,

with the single exception of S. Antony of Padua, whose compositions, as we now have them, are little more than a bundle of heads, and could only have been preserved from dryness by length. Take, for example, the commencement of one on the 4th Sunday after Trinity. The text is, 'Be ye also merciful, as your Father which is in heaven is merciful.'

'Four things,' he says, 'are here to be noted. Firstly, the affluence of goodness which we ought to imitate; in these words, *Be ye merciful.* Secondly, the opulence of celestial felicity on which we ought to meditate: *good measure.* Thirdly, the misery of internal blindness, which we ought to avoid: *How can the blind lead the blind?* Fourthly, the craftiness of fraternal pravity, against which we ought to guard: *Why beholdest thou the mote?* In this first head are five remarkable points: to have pity; not to judge; not to condemn; to forgive, and to give. . . . . And notice, that as the mercy of the FATHER is threefold towards thee, so thine must be threefold towards thy neighbour. The mercy of the FATHER is specious, spacious, and precious; thy mercy also must be threefold. If thy neighbour have offended thee, forgive him; if he have erred from the way of truth, instruct him; if he be an hungered, refresh him.'

This may serve as another proof of what we have already asserted, that S. Antony never could have delivered such bony things as this extract to a common congregation; but either they were simply heads for his own use, or for the employment of his brethren, for whose benefit he was compelled to publish his sermons. Yet even in the midst of these innumerable subdivisions, he brings in another illustration like those to which we have already referred, which would naturally take with a country congregation in Italy.

'Let us, therefore, be merciful, and imitate the cranes, who, when they set off for their appointed place, fly up to some lofty eminence, in order that they may obtain a view of the lands which they are going to pass. The leader of the band goes before them, chastises those that fly too slowly, and keeps together the troop by his cry. As soon as he becomes hoarse, another takes his place; and all have the same care for those that are weary; so that, if any one is unable to fly, the rest gather together, and bear him up till he recovers his strength. Nor do they take less care of each other when they are on the ground. They divide the night into watches, so that there may be a vigilant care over all. Those that watch hold a weight in one of their claws, so that, if they happen to sleep, it falls on the ground and makes a noise, and thus convicts them of somnolency. . . . . Let us, therefore, be merciful as the cranes; that, placing ourselves on a lofty watch-tower in this life, we may look out both for ourselves and for others, may lead those that are ignorant of the way, and may chastise the slothful and negligent by our exhortations. Let us succeed alternately to labour. Let us carry the weak and infirm, that they faint not in the way. In the watches of the night, let us keep vigil to the Lord, by prayer and contemplation.'

And so he again returns to the thread of his discourse.

One might arrange mediæval methods of dividing sermons into three classes. The first, that in which there is *bonâ fide* one ext, worked out without reference to the context; the second,

where the whole context is taken as one subject, and not in separate and successive parts, which is the method usually employed by S. Antony, and recommended by S. Charles Borromeo; the third, when the gospel or epistle is treated by way of postill or homily, one verse after the other, till the whole is gone through. And this was the favourite practice of French theologians, such as S. Hildebert, Marbod, S. Fulbert, and their contemporaries, but carried out more perfectly by none than by Rupert of Deutz, whose commentaries *De Gloria et Honore Filii Hominis*, *De Operibus Spiritus Sancti*, and *De Trinitate et Operibus ejus*, are perfect models in their way.

It is worth while to notice how the preachers of whom we are speaking almost intuitively followed S. Augustine's rule as to their style.

'Et tamen cum concinnator debeat rerum doctor esse magnarum, non semper eas debet granditer dicere, sed submissè cum aliquid docetur; temperatè, cum aliquid vituperatur sive laudatur: cum vero aliquid agendum est, et ad eos loquimur qui hoc agere debent, nec tamen volunt, tunc ea quæ magna sunt, dicenda sunt granditer et ad flectendos animos congruenter. Et aliquando de unâ eâdemque re magnâ,et submissè dicitur, si docetur; et temperatè, si predicatur; et granditer, si aversus inde animus ut convertatur impellitur. Quid enim Deo ipso majus est? Numquid ideo non discitur? Aut qui docet unitatem Trinitatis debet nisi submissâ disputatione agere, ut res ad dignoscendum difficilis, quantum datur, possit intelligi? Numquid hic ornamenta et non documenta quærantur? Porro cum laudatur Deus sive de se ipso sive de operibus suis, quanta facies pulcræ ac splendidæ dictionibus obnititur ei, qui potest quantum potest laudare; Quem nemo convenienter laudat, nemo quomodocumque non laudat.'

It is to the ornate style, as it used to be called, that Vieyra alludes, amusingly enough:—

'Is it possible,' he says, 'that we are Portuguese, and hear a preacher speaking in Portuguese, and cannot understand what he says? Just as there is a Lexicon for Greek, and a Calepinus for Latin, so it is necessary to have a vocabulary for the pulpit. I could wish, at all events, that our preachers would be intelligible in their proper names; for they in their ornateness have re-baptized the saints, and every author whom they allege is an enigma. Thus, they speak of the *Penitent Sceptre;* thus, they speak of the *Evangelistic Apelles;* thus, of the *Eagle of Africa;* thus, of the *Honeycomb of Clairvaux*, of the *Purple of Bethlehem*, of the *Mouth of Gold.* Do you call this quoting? They say that the Penitent Sceptre means David; the Evangelistic Apelles, S. Luke; the Honeycomb of Clairvaux, S. Bernard; the Eagle of Africa, S. Augustine; the Purple of Bethlehem, S. Jerome; the Mouth of Gold, S. Chrysostom. But a man might take it the other way, and believe that the Purple of Bethlehem was Herod; the Eagle of Africa, Scipio; the Mouth of Gold, Midas. If an advocate were thus to quote Bartholus or Baldus, would you trust your cause in his hands? If a man were thus to speak in conversation, would you not set him down as a fool? That, then, which is folly in ordinary life, why should it be wisdom in the pulpit?'

We are reminded of an anecdote of that great critic in sermons, Charles Simeon, to whom we have so often referred.

A young composer of sermons was reading a discourse, for the purpose of obtaining the approbation of the author of the 'Horæ Homileticæ.' At length he reached the following passage: 'Amidst the tumult and ecstasy of the children of Israel, the son of Amram stood unmoved.' 'The son of Amram!' interrupted Simeon; 'the son of Amram! who was he?' 'Why, 'Sir, I meant Moses.' 'Then,' thundered the critic, 'if you '*meant* Moses, why not *say* Moses?' But we trust that common sense has very nearly banished this style of preaching from our pulpits. It is too true that the Clergy still preach far above the heads of their country congregations; but it is from carelessness or from hurry, and not because they think it a mark of excellence, as the ornate school did, to be unintelligible.

We had intended to offer some other remarks on the subject which we have been considering; but we are compelled by our limits to forego that design. We shall only say a word or two on one peculiar class of sermons, to which we have not yet referred; those preached at Visitations or before Synods. If till within the last twenty years we have gone on flattering ourselves that the Church of England was the very pattern and quintessence of apostolic purity, and that in so far as any other communion differed from it, so far it was at variance with the perfect model, there is now some little fear lest a few among us should run into the opposite extreme, and imagine that never was any Church at such a distance from primitive excellence, nor so utterly infected with corruption. To any one who entertains these opinions we would recommend a prescription, which should not involve any great degree of trouble, and which may have other advantages besides the specific one for which we would advise its adoption. We would prescribe a course of sermons, say of the eleventh or twelfth centuries, delivered to Synods, whether diocesan or provincial. It is curious to see how the same complaints have been made, in all ages, of remissness in supporting the faith, of negligence in the cure of souls, of degeneracy from primitive times. S. Hildebert, in addressing the Clergy of Angers or Tours; S. Fulbert, in his Diocesan Synods of Chartres; S. Norbert, preaching before the priests of Magdeburg; S. Anselm, in Normandy and at Canterbury; S. Arnoul at Soissons; S. Frederick at Utrecht: all bear witness to the same thing. True, it is with no uncertain sound that those Charges for the most part spoke. They were not quite of the same kind with that of a clergyman who preached a Visitation sermon before Bishop North of Winchester, and chose for his subject, The Existence of a God. When it was afterwards gently hinted by some of his brethren that he might have chosen a more edifying topic, 'Why,' said he, 'to tell you

'the truth, it was the only subject of which I could think, on 'which we were likely to be agreed.'

Every one will remember the idea which, as Pugin tells us, he had at first formed of those middle ages: 'holy priests, holy monks, happy people, holy everybody.' It is, therefore, not without its value to see what sort of things were sermons addressed to the Clergy at a time when the discipline of the English Church was such as the famous ballad of the Abbat of Gloucester shows it to have been:—

'Hoc est meum consulatis,
Quod utrumque deponatis,—
Et Prioris et Abbatis
Ad sua piloria.

'Absit, dicit alter clerus,
Quia bibit parum merus,
Quod punitur tam severus
Per noster consortia:

'Esset enim hoc riotus,
Quod pro stultus horum potus
Sustineret clerus totus
Pudor et scandalia.'

Thus it is that Peter of Blois speaks to the Clergy of that era:—

'O, how dreadful, how dangerous a thing, my brethren, is the administration of your office! Ye are held to answer, not only for yourselves, but for the souls of those that are committed to you in the day of tremendous judgment; and how shall he keep another man's conscience who cannot keep his own? For conscience is an inscrutable abyss, a most obscure night; and yet it is this night in which that miserable priest is concerned, and about which he is occupied. "Watchman, what of the night? Watchman, what of the night?" What will that priest do who feels himself loaded with sins, involved in cares, infected with the vileness of carnal desires, blind, bowed down, infirm, pressed with a thousand difficulties, struggling against a thousand necessities, troubled with a thousand doubts, propense to vice, weak to virtue? What will he do, the son of grief, the son of eternal despair, who neither kindles in himself nor in others the fire of charity? Surely, he is prepared to be the food for the consumption of fire.'

Many are the thrilling passages which those old writers have when they are addressing their brother clergy; and many a lesson is to be learnt from such discourses, both curious historically, and interesting practically. He would surely not be misspending his time, who would give an edition of some of the discourses *ad Clerum* of English divines, from Lanfranc to Warham, tracing the gradual corruption of discipline, the gradual rise of heresy, the fuller and fuller development of worldliness, the signs of the gathering storm, as early as the age of Henry V., the disregard shown of its warnings, and the final crash.

Many and many a curious complaint, singularly like some of those of the present day, would thus be brought to light; many and many such a passage as the following in Peter of Blois, which reads like a mediævalised extract from the weekly newspapers of the present day, whose editors and contributors only seem to go to church for the express purpose of finding fault with the services and sermons of their friends, by way of conciliating their enemies.

'There are some,' says the Archdeacon, 'who when they 'have begun a verse, think the time endless till they can get to 'its close; and so run the words one into another in their hurry, 'that in the honeycomb of the law remains neither wax nor 'honey. They gulp down a whole verse in one breath, and so 'gallop through the Lord's song, that they cut it down to half 'its length by clipping its words; their lips are in the chant, 'but their hearts in the platter.' And so in another place he says, '"Let all those that seek Thee be joyful and glad in 'Thee;" but those are not glad in God who make such inordi-'nate clippings and slurrings, nor are clippings of this kind 'acceptable to the Lord.'

We have thus noted a few of the most striking characteristics of mediæval sermons. Would that we could induce any of our brethren to try for themselves whether, by a little study of the writers whom Andrewes, and Donne, and Cosin, had in their hearts and in their memories, their own discourses would not be improved; whether that which is now so often a grievous task, the making or repatching of the Saturday's sermons, would not become a profit and a pleasure, if they would but be at the trouble of first reading over what such authors as Rupert of Deutz, or Hugh of S. Victor, or Rhabanus Maurus, or, far greater than all, S. Bernard, have said on the same text! It is useless to recommend, for general use, so large and expensive a work as the *Bibliotheca Patrum Concionatoria* of Caubefis. But he that should have mastered that, would be stocked with the knowledge, and he that could be imbued with the spirit of the *Rhetorica Sacra* of Luiz de Granada, the masterwork on the subject, would be kindled into the spirit, of well-nigh a perfect preacher.

ART. II.—1. *Analysis of the Evidence given before a Select Committee of the House of Lords, and a Select Committee of the House of Commons, appointed during the Session* 1852, *to inquire into the Operation of the Act* 3 *and* 4 *Will. IV. cap.* 85. *for the better Government of Her Majesty's Indian Territories.* London: 1853. [Printed for the East India Company.]

2. *Second Report from the Select Committee of the House of Lords.* [*Brought from the Lords and ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, June* 16, 1853. *No.* 627. I.]

3. *Sixth Report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons.* [*Ordered to be Printed, Aug.* 8, 1853. *No.* 897.]

4. *An Act to Provide for the Government of India,* (*August* 20, 1853,) 16 *&* 17 *Vict. cap.* 95.

ON no former occasion have the political privileges of the East India Company been renewed with so little discussion on the state and prospects of the Church within the extensive territories entrusted to their administration, as during the progress of the East India Bill. Select Committees were appointed by both Houses of Parliament in 1852, to inquire into the whole operation of the Act of 1833, which, among other ecclesiastical provisions, enacted the erection of episcopal Sees at Madras and Bombay. The inquiry was divided under eight heads, the seventh of which was entitled 'Ecclesiastical Provision for the Diffusion of Christian Spiritual Instruction:' but the close of the session found neither Committee advanced beyond the first division: and the Bill for prolonging the Company's government was introduced in 1853. As this measure related exclusively to the single division of the inquiry which had been sufficiently investigated, described as 'The Authorities and Agencies for administering the Government of India at Home and in India respectively,' it seems to have been intended that other Bills should follow on the remaining branches, when ripe for legislation. On former occasions the Company's administration was renewed for a specific term of years, and at each renewal Parliament annexed its conditions to the lease, remaining content with its bargain till the expiry of the period. This was a clumsy kind of legislation, but, like the system of ecclesiastical leases, not without some advantages at a time when corruption and the spirit of party ran so high in the legislature, that a distant province could only be kept safe by removing it

beyond the reach of mischievous interference. In the present Act no term of years is fixed, and Parliament is understood to have reserved the power of introducing at any time such amendments and additions as appear to be necessary. The Committees proceeding at the same time with the other seven branches of the inquiry, suggested of course the expectation of further legislation at least upon these important subjects.

This mode of proceeding, in itself perhaps more dignified than the other, was no doubt highly convenient both to the Queen's Government and the Court of Directors. It saved a world of trouble and discussion, while securing the point of chief importance to the administration. The authorities of Canon-row and Leadenhall-street, preserving a decent appearance of their traditional antagonism, yet softened towards each other so far that the Board of Control raised the nominal stipends of the Directors to the respectable salaries of 1,000*l.* and 500*l.* per annum, while Sir James Hogg, the Company's parliamentary Coryphæus, reciprocated the compliment by proposing and carrying the sum of 5,000*l.* for the President of the Board of Control. The House and the public meanwhile looked on quietly, not to say apathetically, and the *first* Act for the Government of India is now in operation.

We hear nothing, however, of the *second* or the *third*, and our doubt is, how far, after the Home and Indian Governments have got rid of the pressure on themselves, they will be inclined to bestow their attention on questions which have lost the opportunity of compelling a settlement. With some anxiety on this point, we propose in the present article to discuss that branch of the inquiry which naturally possesses the chief interest for our readers.

The condition of the English Church in India is completely *sui generis*. Nothing exactly like it exists either at home or in any of our Colonial Dioceses, and we shall endeavour in the first place to establish a true notion of the systems in actual operation.

There are in India three distinct organizations comprised under the name of the Church of England. 1. *The Government Ecclesiastical Establishments;* 2. *The Missions of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel;* and, 3. *Those of the Church Missionary Society.* Each exhibits some features of the Church, and doubtless embodies a genuine ecclesiastical idea. But having grown up by accident more than from design, neither fully realizes its own mission, while the combination which constitutes a flourishing Church is altogether wanting.

The Government Ecclesiastical Establishment is stated in a return delivered to the House of Commons (Sixth Report,

Appx. No. 6) to consist of three bishops, three archdeacons, (who are also chaplains), and 122 chaplains and assistant-chaplains, who (with the exception of one in each Presidency, selected by the Bishop for his domestic chaplain) officiate at the different civil and military stations.

The archdeacons are appointed by the bishops, receiving an additional allowance of 300*l.* a-year, but retaining the duties as well as the emoluments of their respective chaplaincies. The bishoprics are in the patronage of the President of the Board of Control, and the assistant chaplaincies in that of the Directors, the 'assistants' rising to be 'chaplains' by seniority.

The salaries are nearly as follows:—

Bishop of Calcutta (Metropolitan) *per annum*	£5,000
„ Madras „	2,500
„ Bombay „	2,500
Senior Presidency Chaplain	1,200
Junior „ „	980
Chaplains (in Bengal)	960
„ in Madras and Bombay	840
Assistant-Chaplains	600

Additional allowances on a liberal scale are made to the bishops to cover the expenses of their Visitations, and also to the chaplains when travelling on duty. Retiring pensions are provided, for the Bishop of Calcutta after ten years' service in India, and for the Bishops of Madras and Bombay after fifteen; previous service as archdeacon being reckoned in the period. The chaplains also enjoy retiring pensions after fifteen years' Indian service, with proportionate allowances while on furlough or sick leave, and half-pay if compelled by a failure of health to retire before the period of pension.

The origin of this Establishment is coeval with the Company itself; the following being extracted from the Charter of Incorporation, dated 22d July, 1702.

'And Her Majesty's further will and pleasure is, and she doth hereby direct and appoint, that the said English Company and their successors according to the provision made in that behalf in their said Charter of 5th September, in the tenth year of his said late Majesty's reign, shall constantly maintain . . . one Protestant minister in every garrison and superior factory which the same Company or their successors shall have in the East Indies, or other parts within the limits aforesaid; and shall also in such garrisons and factories respectively provide, or set apart, a decent and convenient place for Divine Service only; . . . and, moreover, that no such minister shall be sent by the same Company to the said East Indies, or other the parts within the limits aforesaid, until he shall have been first approved of by the Archbishop of Canterbury or Bishop of London for the time being; and Her Majesty doth hereby further will and appoint that all such ministers as shall be sent as aforesaid to reside in India, or other the

parts within the limits aforesaid, be obliged to learn, within one year after their arrival, the *Portuguese language; and shall apply themselves to learn the native language of the country where they shall reside, the better to enable them to instruct the Gentoos, that shall be servants or slaves of the same Company or of their agents, in the Protestant religion*; and, further, that the said English Company, and their successors, shall, from time to time, provide schoolmasters in all the said garrisons and superior factories where they shall be found necessary.'

At the time this Charter was granted the Company possessed in India only a few commercial factories, and not a single British soldier had as yet set foot upon its soil. Their chaplains were therefore plainly intended for the spiritual instruction of the *Natives*, and we believe that the regiments first sent out by the Crown took their own military chaplains with them. This practice, however, was speedily discontinued. The care of the soldiery was thrown upon the Company's chaplains, who in consequence came to be considered as appointed exclusively for that purpose. All 'interference with the religion of the Natives,' that is, all attempts at the propagation of Christianity, were vehemently condemned by a Government which took the Pagodas under their immediate patronage, and made a very good thing of the management of 'Church Lands,' formerly wasted by unprincipled Brahmins.

At present the Court of Directors, as we learn from their secretary,[1]

'have laid it down as a principle, that the religious benefit of the servants of Government is the *only* ground upon which an ecclesiastical establishment can be maintained at the charge of the Indian revenue. Conversion, they think, should not be carried on through Government agency; any attempt of the kind, it is believed, would retard the progress of Christianity; in which their opinion coincides with that of Bishop Heber.'—*Analysis*, p. 121.

We must not here stay to remark on the ingenuity which would cover the Company's former undisguised resistance—and its present too-evident disinclination—to Missionary operations,[2] with the cloak of a righteous zeal for the purity of the Gospel. We remember the opposition to the erection of the See of Calcutta, and the predictions then made of the disorder and rebellion to be introduced among the 'gentle Hindoos' by the 'fanatical' attempts to convert them to Christianity. We cannot quite forget that Bishop Middleton was smuggled on shore without the usual marks of respect, for fear of exciting the Natives; and there is an ugly story somewhere, of a

[1] The Company's 'Charter' has been twice carried through Parliament by this distinguished officer, the most able of a remarkably able family. The civil riband of K.C.B. attests rather than rewards his labours on the late occasion.

[2] 'If I were not afraid of having my expression misunderstood, I should say there is more than indifference; the Government rather lean against the missionaries.'—*Rev. W. Keane, Lords' Second Report, Qu.* 7,892.

chaplain being warmly reprimanded for baptizing a sepoy. But let bygones be bygones. The principle laid down by Sir J. C. Melvill is now undoubtedly generally accepted; though we must be allowed to remark that the obligation laid upon the Company in its original charter having been no way abrogated in any of the subsequent renewals of its political or commercial privileges, cannot be repudiated so easily as they seem to think.

In the disposal of their chaplains—

'it has been the principle of the Government to provide, in the first place, for those stations where there are regular European troops; after these are supplied, the Presidency towns (Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay), where large numbers of Protestants in the service of Government are congregated, are considered to have the first claim in the allotment of Chaplains, and those which then remain[1] are placed at the discretion of Government, in communication with the bishop, at those stations where there may be the greatest number of civil and military officers.'—*Commons' Sixth Report*, 1853, *Qu.* 10,012.

Smaller stations are visited periodically by the Chaplains from the principal station most conveniently situated for the purpose. This 'convenience' may be appreciated when we state that 'the District' assigned to a friend of our own consisted of a Native State as large as Ireland, containing five 'out stations,' the nearest of which was 30 miles from his residence, and the furthest 120. Archdeacon Shortland speaks of districts still larger, but as a general rule 100 miles is considered the furthest limit at which a Chaplain should be called upon to extend his ministrations. In making his annual circuit our friend travelled considerably above a thousand miles, in a country which has neither railways nor turnpike roads, but mere tracks, over most of which the horse or the palanquin forms the only means of conveyance. During his absence the principal station was left to the other Chaplain (when it had another), or else was unserved. Yet that the district duty could not be neglected is evident, from the fact that as many Communicants at the Holy Eucharist were mustered among these scattered companies as in the large station itself.

Such is the Government Establishment, so far as the Church of England is concerned. Two chaplains of the Kirk of Scotland are maintained at each Presidency, on exactly the same footing, and four Bishops of the Church of Rome receive each a stipend of 240*l.* a-year, for 'superintending' the clergy officiating to the Roman Catholic soldiery. In the appointment of these Romish 'chaplains,' (as they are self-styled,) the Govern-

[1] 'This is hardly correct; the churches at the Presidencies are supplied *before* any others. A friend of ours was kept officiating in one for some time, while two military stations to which he was successively appointed remained unsupplied,

ment does not interfere, but certain small allowances are made to them through their bishops.[1]

These establishments are regarded as forming the Ecclesiastical department of the Government Service. Rank and precedence 'in the Service' are allotted to the Bishops, Archdeacons, and Chaplains. Not only the erection and repairs of their churches, but every expense of Divine Service, down to washing the surplices, and even paying for the Sacramental elements, are furnished at the public charge, on the same principle as hospitals and medicines are provided to the Company's servants free of expense.

Hence a whole system of Ecclesiastical Orders of Government comes into existence. The Government corresponds with the chaplains through the Bishop as the head of their department, and this *bureaucratic* relation entirely eclipses the spiritual. The Bishop in his episcopal character licenses the chaplains, he visits and delivers a Charge, (which, by the way, used to reach his clergy first in the columns of a London Paper;) but the chaplains are appointed and removed from church to church by the Government: their emoluments and duties are all controlled by Government regulations: and the Bishop's power practically depends upon his personal influence with the clergy, or upon the amount of pressure which his private acquaintance with the Governor enables him to apply. An Ecclesiastical Court has been provided by law; but it has never been opened: and Bishop Heber's attempt to constitute his Consistory proved a failure. There is no power, it seems, of enforcing the attendance of witnesses or the execution of the decree. Bishop Spencer says:—

'The Bishops have sufficient authority over the subordinate Clergy, *when they are on good terms* with the Government of the day; but if the Government and the Bishop happen to disagree, then the Bishop, I am bound to say, is not so much supported as he ought to be.'—*Lords' Committee Second Report*, 1853, *Qu.* 8,418.

The episcopal licence possesses no greater value in the eyes of an Indian Governor than of a Foreign Secretary of State. We remember a chaplain removed from his station by the Governor in opposition to the Bishop, as a punishment for some alleged neglect of duty at a funeral. He was appointed to a less eligible station at a considerable distance (thus mulcting him in

[1] Some of these bishops occasionally receive a further allowance as chaplains themselves; and there is a proposal to raise the three bishops at Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay to about 500*l.* a-year, and give increased official recognition to them and their clergy. The government favour has been strongly marked towards them, but it is checked by the frequent ebullitions of the Irish Priests. On more than one occasion the troops have been marched out of Chapel to avoid their seditious sermons; and the Brigadier at Secunderabad was compelled to expel a bishop *by force* from the cantonment!

the costs of removal), and another chaplain was nominated to succeed him. The Bishop refused to alter the licences of either; but on the appearance of the exchange in the Government Orders, the salaries of both clergymen ceased till they had reported their arrival at the stations to which they were appointed. Of course they were obliged to officiate in their new churches without licences. Indeed it has been questioned whether by their appointments under the Royal Charter with the approval of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Company's chaplains are not legally qualified to officiate within the British territories without further ecclesiastical sanction. A still more summary proceeding was resolved on by one of the Madras Governors. Finding he could not prevail on the Clergy to sanction the admission of Dissenting Missionaries to officiate at funerals in the consecrated burying-grounds, he directed a portion of the adjoining ground (unconsecrated) to be annexed to every government grave-yard: and then, to abolish invidious distinctions, actually ordered the wall of the consecrated portion to be thrown down, so as to unite the two within one enclosure, and the funerals of Dissenters to be admitted at the original gate, and so pass over the consecrated ground to their own.

With such Governors it is manifestly unsafe for the Bishop to apply the *argumentum ad crumenam* to a chaplain. It may often recoil with an unpleasant force upon himself. After all, too, bishop, archdeacon, and chaplain, being every one stipendiaries on the public treasury, and all their incidental expenses charged in addition on the same quarter, it is perfectly natural that Government should expect the work it pays for—and pays with great liberality—to be executed under its own orders and to the taste of the employer.

In short, this establishment is a pure Erastianism; and the effects are sometimes curious. On one occasion when it was proposed to build a new church at our friend's station, the engineer officer received instructions from the Military Board to prepare the plans, just as would be done for a barrack or other public building. Being well acquainted with the officer, the chaplain carried him his rough design, and proposed to consult on the plans to be submitted. He was little prepared for the good-natured merriment with which the other enjoyed the idea of the *Padré* stepping out of his own department to meddle with brick and chunam: he might as well have proposed to assist in breaching a fortress. It was the soldier's business to build the church, the clergyman's to preach in it. But as church architecture forms no part of the Addiscombe *curriculum*, there is of course little ecclesiastical propriety in our Indian churches. Another result is that these churches, even after consecration, are still

regarded as Government property. They are cleaned and repaired by the public servants, two military officers being usually nominated as 'trustees' to act in conjunction with the chaplain in applying for the necessary orders. Our friend was once incautious enough to ask the commissariat officer to supply his church with two dozen towels to clean the lamps. The requisition was readily complied with; but some months after he received a portentous looking official despatch from the major, enclosing another of still larger dimensions from the auditor-general, which directed him immediately to demand of the chaplain the sum of four rupees (eight shillings!) in payment for the said towels; and to refer the reverend delinquent to the orders of Government, under which the Church Committee should prepare an *indent* (on foolscap paper, and made out in *quadruplicato*) to be sent to the Bishop, who was to forward it (*in triplicato*) to the Governor in Council, who would transmit it *in duplicate* to the Military Board, who would finally return to our station the single copy garnished with all these 'potent, grave, and reverend' signatures; and then the four rupees were to be returned, and the towels appropriated for ever to the use of the church. The chaplain answered that considering the price of foolscap in India, and the other labours of the Bishop and Governor (not to mention his own) in that oppressive climate, he preferred to pay the rupees, and leave alone the suggested game at the 'House that Jack built.'

A Government clergy implies of course a Government laity. Having slipped the yoke of their original charter, the Directors steadily close their purses against the spiritual necessities of any but the servants of Her Majesty and the Honourable Company. At the Presidency towns, where a large European and East Indian population is resident, comprising barristers, merchants, and other 'respectable' men, a larger number, both of churches and chaplains, are maintained than the 'principle' would absolutely justify; a deviation partly compensated by levying pew rents in aid of the expenses of Divine Service. Anything, however, like a Christian community is utterly ignored. Sir James Melvill, when questioned with regard to parts of the south of India, where entire villages have become Christian, doubts

'whether the authorities would be willing to provide the means of Christian instruction for the inhabitants.'—*Analysis*, p. 121.

The rulers of India have no idea of Government *aid* without Government *agency;* and though in these parts no question of 'conversion' arises, the Secretary has an equally plausible reason for non-interference:—

'There are institutions in the country connected with the native creeds; but a great object of the Government, for many years past, has been to get rid of all connexion with them.'—*Ibid.* p. 122.

So in common fairness there must be no encouragement of Christian creeds either! Time was when the championship of idolatry (for which it was pretended the faith of Government had been plighted to the natives) was made the plea for discountenancing Christianity. Now the recently enforced renunciation of that degrading connexion is made to serve the same end. Meanwhile it must be always remembered that the instruction of their native dependents 'in the Protestant religion' is a *legal obligation* on the Honourable Company, independently of the great argument of Christian responsibilities.

We shall return to this subject by-and-by; at present we would point out that the Government Church is *de facto* composed only of the Government servants. Now, when it is remembered that, with a few insignificant exceptions, these are foreigners sojourning in the country for their own temporary occasions, and all—clergy no less than laity—looking to England as their home, it must be apparent that these chaplains and their congregations have scarcely any pretension to the character of a local Church. Their connexion with the bishop is of the most transitory and technical description; nor, as the congregations are constantly changing chaplains, has the parochial relation any more substantial existence.

Let us proceed then to the Missions of the Church of England; where the Gospel is certainly preached without distinction of race or occupation, and Christian worship is planted among the people as a matter of religion, not of Government administration.

Our Missions are conducted partly by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and partly by the Church Missionary Society, both without aid from the Government or any recognised connexion with the 'Government Church.'

The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel has inherited the Missions formerly carried on by the Lutheran Missionaries maintained by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, and into which the original Danish Mission at Tranquebar,—the mother of all the flourishing Churches now blooming in the south of India,—has more recently merged.

The principles and practice of this excellent Society are well known to our readers. Its missionaries are not only placed under the bishop *in spiritualibus*, but the ecclesiastical authorities are the Society's agents and representatives in all affairs whatever. The bishop is in fact the Society, in regard to whatever is to be done within his diocese. He has usually a credit in Pall-Mall to draw upon as he sees occasion. He selects, appoints, and removes the missionaries at his pleasure. Missions are opened and relinquished by his sole authority, or by a Committee in which he is supreme. Then, the Indian episcopate finds no

lack of support. Ample verge and room enough is given it to take root and grow out into an indigenous Church; of which Tinnevelly and Sawyerpooram give more than promise.

It must be borne in mind, however, that all the Society's missionaries are stipendiaries on the treasury in Pall Mall, as the chaplains are on that of the Honourable Company. There is no danger in their case of the bishop being resisted; but then it is the bag rather than the keys by which he binds or looses. It is as the Society's agent that he obtains the power which his spiritual office alone, in its present constitution, could not exert. This is proved by the actual results under the different system of the Church Missionary Society. The ecclesiastical relations of Bishop, Priest, and Patron, are defined in their regulations more distinctly than by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and more accurately than by the Governments of India. They relegate the bishop strictly to his spiritual office; not professing to introduce a clergyman except under his licence, and charging their missionaries to observe all due canonical obedience to the bishop. They only reserve to their Committee the powers of patron; that is, of nominating and removing the missionary, as well as of controlling every proceeding which requires—and what is there that does not require?—the outlay of money. For here again the missionaries are stipendiaries, and their churches, schools, and every item of necessary expenditure, entirely at the mercy of the lay patron. This is the Salisbury Square theory. But we are not aware that ecclesiastical patrons in any other case retain the power of *removing* the clerk whom they present to be instituted to cure of souls.

The Bishop then finds himself practically in the same dilemma with this Society that he does with the Government. While at amity with the guardians of the purse, he may do as he likes with the clergy; but should a difference of 'views' arise, 'he is not so well supported as he ought to be.' The missionary who may prefer his diocesan's views to those of his *patron*, will not long find himself in a position to retain his canonical relations. The proceeding is not so unceremonious as a Government order; yet the missionary is equally divested of his mundane accessories: his schoolmasters, readers, catechists are removed, yea his church, and the very house over his head, entered upon as 'Mission Property;' and the interdict will remain till the delinquent is gone, and the successor, humbly nominated for the bishop's licence, has been graciously admitted in his place. The stipendiary relation, as usual, swallows up every other.

It appears from the evidence of Mr. Tucker that the Church

Missionary Society has in India 88 ordained clergymen (of whom 73 are Europeans, 3 East Indians, and 12 natives), and that their converts amount to 36,401. The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel has 43 ordained Missionaries, with 22,905 Native Christians: making a total of 131 clergymen, and 59,306 laity. Hence the non-official Church of England is more numerous than the official.

Another return delivered in by Mr. Tucker gives the results of all the Protestant Missionary Societies in India and Ceylon, up to January 1852. From this statement, which was compiled with great care by a Conference of all denominations at Calcutta, it appears that the total number of Mission Stations is 272, Missionaries, 400; Communicants, 17,622; Native Christians, 108,174. Of these the Church of England has 110 Stations, 139 Missionaries, 10,647 Communicants, and 64,235 Native Christians:[1] showing that with not half the Stations, and just a third the number of Missionaries, the Church has gathered in from the heathen half as many more than all the other Societies put together, and has a still larger proportion of communicating members.

Some of this superiority may be owing to the riper growth of a portion of our Missions; but we are persuaded that it chiefly arises from the superior efficacy of the Church's system. A large portion of the results often attributed to other agencies might be traced to the use of the Book of Common Prayer, now translated into various languages. Thus in Ceylon, the largest Wesleyan congregation was that of Dr. Percival, who had adopted the whole Church Services, said *chorally*, in Tamul. In our friend's station in India there were ordinarily eight or nine missionaries of the London and Wesleyan Societies, and not one of the Church of England. Yet when he erected a Native Church and opened a Mission, to which (having the whole care of the station at that time upon his hands) but a small portion of his personal labours could be given, the Native congregation far outnumbered those of the three dissenting Missions put together.[2] The experience of this truth it is, which has

	Stations.	*Missionaries.*	*Communicants.*	*Native Christians.*
[1] Society for the Propagation of the Gospel.	49	44	5,025	25,498
Church Missionary Society	61	95	5,622	38,737
	110	139	10,647	64,235

The last published Reports of the two Societies make the Missionaries in *English Orders* to be—*Society for the Propagation of the Gospel*, 53; *Church Missionary Society*, 94; *Total*, 147; *i. e.* eight *more* than stated in this return.

[2] The happiest effects were experienced from the observance of daily prayer in this church; a practice almost universal among our Native Congregations. It

latterly led many of the best missionaries of other denominations (including Dr. Percival) to seek admission into the Church.

With such facts before us, it is the more deeply to be regretted that our Church should be still without a permanent footing in India. With the exception of the Bishop of Calcutta's noble design of a cathedral (fit companion to Bishop Middleton's college), nothing has yet been done or attempted towards endowing the Church as an indigenous institution. Our bishops, chaplains, and missionaries are with a few exceptions aliens and sojourners in the land: all of them are stipendiaries on a foreign exchequer. Three strokes of the pen in London would suffice to extinguish the Church in India. Let the Russians occupy Calcutta, and while the Brahminical and Mahometan religions (equally the introduction of foreign invaders) would remain rooted in the land, the Anglican would have disappeared and 'left not a wreck behind.'

This reflection must be often forced upon the thoughts of those who turn to the Portuguese churches in the south and west of India. The political power of that nation—never equal to our own—has long entirely ceased. Yet they have left an archbishopric at Goa, which at this day is contending against Rome itself for the primacy of India, and in the heart of our own stations, and all along our coasts, their priests maintain their footing by means of endowments wisely provided while the opportunity was allowed.[1] Yet we who respect these endow-

was the constant rallying point of the Christians, and the principal means of aggression on the heathen. Many of the latter frequently paused to witness and listen to the new *poojah* (worship); when the temple full of light, and void of idols—the worshippers all admitted within the temple—the constant spiritual sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving—and their audible intercourse with heaven, in prayers on the one hand and absolution and benedictions on the other—proved effectual with some to inquire further, and finally to embrace the truth. Without a single preaching in the street, (for which he had no time or opportunity,) this chaplain baptized above one hundred Natives in five years, and increased the congregation from forty to three hundred. The Visitation of the Sick, also, and the Burial Service, had a great Missionary influence.

[1] During the sway of the Portuguese a Concordat was established with Rome, by which the 'Primacy of the Indies' was granted to the Archbishop of Goa, and the patronage of that and the other sees conceded to the Crown of Portugal. This arrangement subsisted down to the overthrow of Dom Miguel, when the Holy See, not choosing to recognise the title of Donna Maria, discovered that the Crown of Portugal had no longer any claim to authority in India, and superseded the Concordat. This determination, being contemporaneous with certain efforts of the Irish Roman Catholic Members of Parliament in London, was believed in India to have had reference to the celebrated Lichfield House compact. Certain it is that a posse of Irish Bishops and Priests suddenly landed in Madras, armed with the Papal authority, and proceeded to lay claim to the endowments of the Portuguese. Their pretensions were immediately countenanced at Government House, where the Roman Catholic Bishop of Madras' (though no such title was bestowed in the bulls of the Vicar Apostolic) became a frequent guest. The Government at first recognised him as the official representative of the Roman Catholic Clergy,

ments whilst lamenting their present inefficient application, are content to scour the face of the country with a cloud of spiritual Cossacks, ready to draw bridle and disappear at the sound of the bugle! After perusing the evidence taken by the Parliamentary Committees, we are more than ever convinced that it is to this point attention is now chiefly, if not solely, demanded; all the rest is mere matter of detail. But we will not anticipate.

In the spring of 1852, a joint conference was opened in London, by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and the Church Missionary Society, to take into consideration the measures that should be proposed to Parliament. After several meetings it was resolved—

'That it is advisable—1. To press for an increase of the episcopate in India. 2. To represent the necessity of an increased number of chaplains and assistant chaplains, and to ask for grants-in-aid towards the support of clergymen in the smaller English stations, where there is no chaplain or assistant chaplain. 3. To recommend the appointment of native sub-assistant chaplains, as already recommended by the Bishop of Calcutta, to minister to native Christians connected with the Honourable Company's service. 4. To point out the importance of increased means, and an improved system of education in India, and to call attention to the especial claims of the poorer classes of Europeans and East Indians connected with the public service.'—*Lords' Second Report, App. P.*

---

and transferred the military duties from the poor Portuguese priests, to the Irishmen nominated by 'his Lordship.' The 'Diocesan' clergy were not so easily persuaded. The Bishop elect of St. Thomé administering under the Archbishop of Goa, though denied episcopal consecration by the Holy See, garrisoned his Cathedral, and charged all his vicars to resist the Irish Capuchin. A battle royal would have ensued but for a Scotch Justice of the Peace (doubtless a Presbyterian), who threatened the Irish with the terrors of a 'summary conviction,' and they withdrew. The question was afterwards brought into the Supreme Court, where the claims of Rome against Portugal were solemnly argued before a chief justice who had sworn that '*no* foreign Prince, Prelate, Pope, or Potentate, hath or ought to have any power, &c. within Her Majesty's dominions!'

The Archbishop of Goa has been once recalled to Rome, but the Arch-Chapter sent for the Bishop of Macao, and still carry on the war. The curious result is, that while recognised by the Holy See within the limits of their own Diocese as good Catholics,—the moment they pass beyond it to exercise the 'primacy,' they and their priests are pronounced schismatical. The whole transaction is represented by the Romish adherents as a mark of the Pope's friendly disposition towards the British Crown, by granting his authority only to British subjects, and they request our Government in return not to recognise any Goa priest.

The latter, on the other hand, appeal to the English Clergy to support the Native 'Diocesan' authority against the Propaganda at Rome. We remember a chaplain holding a conversation in Latin on the top of St. Thomas's Mount with one of these good men, in which they both cordially agreed that the Pope would do well to look to his own Diocese, instead of meddling with theirs. The worthy priest (who was as black as our shoe) was clad in a white cotton cassock, confined by a single button on his shoulder: and as this was the Padre's *only* garment, and the skirt blew freely in the wind, while they paced up and down before his church, his outer man was perhaps *cooler* than the inner.

Such was the case presented on the part of the Church; and to sustain it, the witnesses called were, the Right Rev. Bishop Spencer late of Madras, the Right Rev. Bishop Carr late of Bombay, Archdeacon Shortland a Madras Chaplain, the Rev. W. Keane, who astonished Lord Ellenborough by giving in the designation of 'Missionary Canon of St. Paul's Cathedral Calcutta,' and the Rev. J. Tucker, Secretary to the Church Missionary Society, who for experience, largeness of views, and practical acquaintance with his subject, we may say without flattery, is by far the most deserving of attention. No one appeared on behalf of the other Societies, an omission which we can neither explain nor approve of. It would have been well, also, if some more of the Company's chaplains had been examined, especially those who, having been stationed up the country, have combined Missionary exertions with their official duties.

On the first of the wants before named, there is not an entire agreement among the witnesses. Bishops Wilson and Spencer both press for a division of their dioceses by the erection of new sees at Agra and Trichinopoly. Bishop Carr would be content with a rearrangement of the boundaries between Bombay and Madras. Mr. Tucker, admitting the diocese of Calcutta to be too large, is not of the same opinion with regard to Madras, where he thinks other objects of more importance than an increase of the episcopate. He objects also to a transfer of the whole western coast to the diocese of Bombay. The Court of Directors, it is understood, object to any increase of the episcopate, conceiving it to be of more importance to augment the number of chaplains; and upon the principle laid down by the Court, *and apparently accepted by the others*, they are, we conceive, in the right. This is a point on which we must claim to speak frankly: and we must be understood to speak distinctly of Indian Bishops as they are, not as we conceive they should be.

We do not undervalue the characters or labours of any of our Indian bishops; and we hold it to be well-nigh impossible to place a successor of the apostles in any country, and upon any system, without much advantage being experienced. But, certainly, when we look at the field which lies before our Indian bishops, the length of time that has elapsed since the erection of their sees, the cost at which they are maintained, and the number of clergy provided for their assistance, without charge or pecuniary responsibility to themselves,—and when we contrast them in these respects with other prelates beyond seas,—we must say we are far from regarding the Indian episcopate with the enthusiasm which so justly attaches

to the Colonial Church in general. It is an axiom at home, that 'as is the schoolmaster so is the school;' and if the Church in India is ever to be set on an improved and permanent footing, we are persuaded the reform must begin with the episcopate. Here, then, we must speak out.

The root of the evil is to be found in the bishop being generally considered, and in considering himself, as a part of the Government Ecclesiastical Establishment. His name is so given in, in all the returns submitted to Parliament. This is the position he occupies in India, as between the Government and their chaplains; in this character alone he is known to the European laity; and this is the light in which he is introduced to the notice of the admiring natives. Escorts and salutes attend his progress through the country; the heathen officials are instructed to meet his lordship with the posse of the Collectorate; and a military friend of ours having to issue such instructions, and doubting how far the natives would or ought to respect the spiritual functionary, actually described him in the public orders as '*General* Lord Bishop of the Presidency.' We shall not easily forget another friend's account of his astonishment, when driving his lordship past the main-guard the officer and his men turned out, and three ruffles of the drum proclaimed the presence of a general officer!

In this official capacity, then, we must agree with the Directors, that there is little occasion for an increase of the episcopate. The chaplains ordained in England, and approved by the Archbishop or Bishop of London, may well be trusted with their official duties. Bishop Wilson suggests a doubt on this head, in proposing that the ecclesiastical patronage should be transferred from the Directors to the Indian Bishops; but Bishop Spencer says,—

'I cannot agree with the Bishop of Calcutta on that point; it would embarrass the Bishop, I think. I should not myself desire it.'—*Lords' Committee, Qu.* 8,384.

And again:—

'During my episcopate, highly respectable men were sent out by the Court of Directors to India. I have heard that in former times this was not the case; but I have no reason to question their having made a very good choice in my time. . . . As a whole, I think their appointments were very good.'—*Ibid. Qu.* 8,379.

Certainly, we should say, the results of the Directors' ecclesiastical patronage will well bear a comparison with any other. Such being the case, and considering the routine character of their duties, their need,—indeed their experience,—of episcopal supervision, is but small. We never knew a chaplain who supposed himself or his people to derive any advantage from the Bishop's visits, beyond his confirming or consecrating

a church. Indeed, a highly judicious and long experienced chaplain once assured us, that he doubted if in many respects matters were not better managed when there was only one bishop in all India than with three. He meant that the action of Government (which in the long run must prevail over their own Establishments) was better conciliated by one bishop at the seat of the supreme government, and an archdeacon at every presidency, than by three independent diocesans. This, it will be said, was a low view to take. We admit it; but it is the view which pervades the evidence before us, and is perhaps universal in India itself. We shall be glad enough, as we hope soon to show, to turn to a higher and more genuine survey of the episcopal office.

But have the Indian Bishops proved of no greater advantage to the *Missions?* Doubtless they have. In ordaining more missionaries, in visiting and confirming their flocks, and in their influence with the Societies and the public, both in India and at home the Bishops, even on their present dejected footing, have very greatly enlarged and improved our missionary operations.

It is well known, however, that Bishop Middleton refused to license any Missionary clergy;—considering the chaplains as exclusively the Established Church, and the proper subjects of his jurisdiction. To this day, also, the interest manifested by an Indian Bishop in the mission churches is regarded by the ruling and largest portion of his countrymen as an extra-official, perhaps romantic, work of supererogation. With the great majority of the army—and in much of India the army is the English community—the word 'Clergyman' is synonymous with 'Chaplain,' and 'Missionary' with 'Dissenter.' Our generals and colonels hear of the Bishop going to visit a *mission* with much the same feeling as an English orthodox squire displays when the Bishop of Manchester pronounces an eulogium on dissenting zeal, or his right reverend brother of Durham contributes a five-pound note to aid the dissenting interests.

Doubtless the missionaries themselves welcome with warm and grateful feelings the visits of their chief pastor; brightened as they always are with an assurance of the kindest personal sympathy, and attended by well-earned encomiums from a quarter which to an English clergyman never speaks in vain. Doubtless, also, it is a great day for the native Christians,—ignored by European, and persecuted by heathen authorities,—when they can lead forth the early procession from their rejoicing villages to meet the episcopal palanquin, and exhibit
he bowing officials that he whom they are obliged to honour
heir father and friend. Still the question returns, whether
e pleasing results imperatively demand an increase of such

an episcopate? When we reflect that the Indian bishops have been, with only two exceptions, selected from the clergy at home, and that none of them, save good Bishop Corrie (whose name must not pass from our pen without a tribute to many excellences, shining, alas! too briefly, in a new and troubled episcopate), had any practical experience of Mission work,—or could even speak the language of the people who received the apostolical benediction from their mouths,—we cannot fancy that much has been added to our missionaries in conference with their bishops. They themselves are to a great extent identified with their people; they hold little Synods among themselves for the regulation of affairs; and they are in constant correspondence with their Committees. The Bishop is a foreigner, sojourning for a while in the country, filling a great official appointment, and looking forward to a pension with an honourable retirement in England. What is there in common between him and the native portions of his diocese? The missionary may, perhaps, get a chance of urging some favourite project on the consideration of the Committee or the Society; but in regard to 'the work of the ministry,' we cannot think it of any vital consequence whether he enjoys such an episcopal visit once in three years, or once in two. Mr. Tucker certainly does not think so; and taking the bishop as simply to supervise the clergy on the existing system—which is the view presented to Parliament—we do not know how it can be made out that Mr. Tucker is mistaken. Wishing well then, as we do, to every proposition for an increase of the episcopate, we wish to see it accompanied in the present instance with some proposals for developing the episcopate into a better agency for enabling the Church to take root and grow in the land. We must candidly admit that money can be better spent than in multiplying ecclesiastical generals to preside over Government bureaux, who visit their flocks with a body-guard of soldiers, and are received by forts and batteries with a discharge of cannon.

Such proposals we now proceed to suggest: and, first, we would cut off the notion of a bishop returning from any Indian diocese to spend the remainder of his days in Europe. A bishop should take his diocese 'for better for worse;' if not strictly 'till death us do part,' yet assuredly till the summons of the Church removes him to a higher sphere, or till age or sickness renders him absolutely incapable of duty. In the latter case, we would provide a comfortable and even dignified retirement; but to grant pensions after a certain period of service is to keep up an idea, which however proper to an officer on foreign service, is fatal to the position of a bishop in his own diocese. There, surely—if anywhere on this side the grave—is he to find his home.

It would in no degree lessen our satisfaction with this proposal, if the abolition of pensions as a matter of service should induce some English clergymen to decline the offer of an Indian bishopric. This would prove a wholesome check on the patronage of the Board of Control; for no man surely ought to 'take this honour to himself' till he is assured that God has called him to it, by finding himself willing to give up country and lands for its sake. Honour to the present Bishop of Calcutta! who, at an advanced age, having served nearly double his legal period, and being in fact once driven to England by alarming sickness, still cleaves to his spouse, and has determined to leave to the cathedral which he has so munificently founded the last and best legacy of its Bishop's ashes. Had he claimed his pension under the Act of Parliament, we might have seen, ere long, more Indian bishops living in inglorious ease at home than are serving against idolatry in the East. By all means, then, let us give up the pension (save upon rare emergencies), and let the equivalent sum be invested towards the extension of the episcopate, on the improved footing we are about to suggest.[1]

Next, we should be disposed greatly to curtail the bishops' connexion with the Government offices. All the internal affairs of the Company's Ecclesiastical Establishment should be left to the regulations of Government, the correspondence being carried on through the archdeacon or senior chaplain, with a reference to the bishop when necessary. Bishop Spencer says,—

'I used to write, upon an average, six hours every day of my life, employing others to copy my letters, and I could hardly get through it. The desk was the great slavery of India. Foolish questions were put; questions which ought not to have been submitted to a bishop were made the subject of a long correspondence. The moving of a pulpit, the rearrangement of a church, the appointment of a sexton, and questions of that sort, which in England would be settled in a very short time (viz. by *not* being submitted to the bishop), there led to a lengthened correspondence.'—*Lords' Committee, Qu.* 8,418.

It is clear the bishops would gain much time by disconnecting themselves from such correspondence, and remitting it to one of the Government chaplains. We should like to know how much the Bishop of London knows of the correspondence carried on through the Chaplain-General at the War Office. It was thought that Bishop Spencer rather affected these matters, as increasing his authority over the chaplains: his successor has

[1] No reflection is here intended on either of the two Indian Prelates now resident in this country; one of whom has no pension, and the other served his full riod as a Company's chaplain before his promotion to the archdeaconry and copate. It cannot, however, be forgotten that there is something of an ano- y in a pensioned and therefore veteran Indian Bishop being instituted to so e, populous, and onerous a Rectory as that of Bath.

actually devolved a large portion of them on the archdeacon. We would make the episcopal relief 'thorough.'

Our next desire would be to abolish all military honours, attendance of heathen officials, and whatever else tends to invest the bishop with the character of a great officer of state. The plea upon which these ceremonial observances are defended is that they are the usual forms of public respect in the country, not confined to military men, but extended to judges, envoys, and other civilians. True, but all these are in the service either of the Queen or the Honourable Company, whose authority properly demands a recognition from all classes of their subjects. It is precisely because we would not have the bishop considered in any earthly 'service' that we wish to do away with these badges of earthly honour. If his position should then appear unusual, it will be because his order has nothing equal or like it among the establishments of Government. Let Christians receive their chief pastor with all the honours that can be suggested. Christian officers and soldiers may salute in military fashion if they will; but natives who have never learnt to bow the knee to the Master, ought not to be called upon to pay obeisance to the disciple. We wonder this inconsistency has so long escaped the Directors, in their scrupulous regard for neutrality.

In seeking thus far to weaken the official character of the episcopate, our object is to give greater prominence to its Christian and ecclesiastical aspect. We will now mention the provisions which strike us as further requisite to this end.

In order to abolish the humiliating dependence of the Indian Church on the Governments of the day, we desire to see the salaries allotted to the bishops and archdeacons, as well as their allowances for visitation charges, converted into permanent endowments. These may remain if necessary, for a time, an annual charge on the revenue; but our ultimate object is to have the capital sum laid out in land; or, what may perhaps suit the circumstances of India better, the land revenue of certain districts transferred to the Church as *Jaghires* for the support of the episcopate. If this conversion were properly managed, a fund for the future increase of the episcopate would be supplied,[1] and the Government be entirely separated from payments which certainly do not harmonise with their professions of neutrality in religious matters.

Next, we are of opinion that the charter so long solicited by the Metropolitan for the incorporation of a *Chapter* at Calcutta

[1] That an increase is *needed*, is, of course, not to be doubted for a moment: we only wish it to be the growth of the country; not an external mechanism obtruded by Act of Parliament.

should be immediately granted; and further, that the same privilege should be extended to the cathedrals of Madras and Bombay. The East India Directors, after subscribing 15,000*l.* to the Calcutta cathedral, and adding another chaplain to their establishment for its service, are now objecting to the Bishop's application for letters patent to incorporate his Chapter, on the pretence that to erect any other corporation in India would be prejudicial to the Company's authority. Nothing could be more futile. The Supreme Court of Judicature has a charter from the Crown, by which it is established as an independent authority. The Queen's Commander-in-Chief is independent; and the bishops themselves are ecclesiastical corporations sole, established by letters patent from the Crown, and legally unconnected with the Company's government. There could be no possible inconvenience in incorporating, by the same authority, a capitular body to advise and assist in the execution of the episcopal office. Such a body is precisely what is most needed to remedy the anomalies now existing in India, and give extension and permanence to the Church, without involving 'Government agency.'

We do not stop to inquire whether the patent as proposed by the Bishop of Calcutta, and settled by the law officers of Sir R. Peel's administration, contains in all respects the most eligible provisions. It is a noble design, conceived in an ardent spirit, and carried forward with splendid liberality; it would be ungenerous to criticise, unwise to mutilate it. The Bishop has given upwards of 22,000*l.* from his own purse, bringing the endowment fund up to 30,000*l.*, besides 80,000*l.* spent on the edifice; 15,000*l.* more is ready to be added from the Begum Sumroo's Fund, which is at the Bishop's disposal; and he would have collected another 15,000*l.* before now, but for the unreasonable jealousy displayed against the regular constitution of his Church. We should esteem it 'a heavy blow and a great discouragement,' if the vault under the altar of S. Paul's, Calcutta, should be opened to receive the bones of its founder before his eyes had seen his devout aspirations realized, and these munificent offerings to God's service resting in the guardianship of a lawful Chapter.

We say, then, that not only should the Calcutta patent be perfected without delay, but that the time is arrived for the establishment of similar institutions at the other presidencies; and we go further: we confidently affirm that the Indian revenues may and ought to be charged with their endowment. This assertion brings us into collision with sundry propositions which pass for maxims at the India House; and as these will meet us at every branch of the inquiry, both as to Church efficiency

and native education, we may as well proceed at once to examine them.

Foremost is the statement of Sir James Melvill, that—

'The Directors have laid it down as a principle, that the religious benefit of the servants of Government is the *only* ground upon which an ecclesiastical establishment can be maintained at the charge of the Indian revenue.'

This principle we must beg leave to examine. And, first, we would ask how long it has entered into the system of the Indian governments? It was clearly not the principle of the Brahminical princes, who endowed the pagodas with the vast revenues which our own Government only lately ceased to administer. It was not the principle of the Mahometan invaders, who carried on the conversion of their subjects through the 'government agency' of the sword. It was not the principle of the Portuguese, when they endowed bishoprics and vicarages for the permanent establishment of the Roman Catholic religion. It was not the principle of the authors of the East India Company's Charter, when they imposed a provision for the instruction of their Gentoo slaves in the Protestant faith; nor of the Imperial legislature in later times when it charged the Indian revenues with the support of three episcopal sees. Finally, the Company's governments knew nothing of such a principle all the time of their connexion with idolatry, when they paid for idols, sacrifices, and priests out of revenues administered by their officers, and the balance of which was carried to the public account.

However plausible, then, this principle may sound, it has never been practically recognised, nor can the authorities who assert it make it square with their own proceedings. At the foot of an account prepared at the East India House, we find the following remark:—

'There are also about thirty priests of the Portuguese Church drawing allowances at rates varying from 10 rupees to 15 rupees *per mensem, for ministering to the wants of the native members of their Church.* THESE STIPENDS HAVE BEEN PAID FROM TIME IMMEMORIAL, and are quite exceptional, no provision being made in any other place for the spiritual wants of either Protestants or Roman Catholics not being servants of Government.'—*Commons' Sixth Report, App. No.* 6.

No doubt these payments are 'exceptional,' from the rule now laid down at the India House; but that this rule is itself the exception from the practical system of the Indian Governments, is shown from these stipends having been paid from time immemorial. They were probably inherited from the Portuguese government. We could point also to Government allowances made to Swartz, Gerickè, and other Protestant Missionaries for the support of their Missions and schools. But

it is only necessary to refer to the present state of the Company's ecclesiastical establishments in the presidency towns to see that, in respect both to chaplains and churches, others than the servants of Government are provided.

How indeed, upon their 'principle,' will the Directors justify the assistance already given to the new cathedral at Calcutta? The English congregation worshipping therein may be chiefly, though not entirely, composed of Government servants (for whom, however, other churches had before been provided), but this will hardly save the 'principle.' In laying the foundation-stone, the Bishop publicly proclaimed his design in these words:—

'In the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, one God blessed for ever, I lay this foundation-stone of the Cathedral Church of S. Paul, Calcutta, designed for a body of devout and learned clergy to conduct the worship of Almighty God therein, according to the doctrine and discipline of the Apostolic Protestant Church of England and Ireland, and to unite with these duties the functions of lecturers on the evidences of the truth of Christianity, and pastors and teachers amongst the heathen and Mahomedan population.'—*Ibid. Qu.* 7958.

So that here not only 'other than Government servants' are provided for, but 'conversion' itself is a principal object of an institution to which the Company could still subscribe £15,000. There is no ground whatever, then, for supposing that the alleged principle was ever a recognised rule of action to the Indian Government. It is important to note this, or we may be told by-and-by that the faith of Government is pledged to the natives for its observance.

Is the principle, then, sound in itself? We say, no: the duty of a Government in this respect is not different towards subjects and servants. If it be their duty to supply the one with the means of religious worship and teaching, it is equally their duty to supply the other. If it be wrong (as the insinuation runs) to take the money of the heathen tax-payer to provide for the worship of his Christian fellow-subject, it must be no less wrong to take it for the spiritual benefit of his European masters, who are far better able to provide for themselves. If you justify the latter on the plea that it is for the benefit of the tax-payer, that having Christian masters they should be preserved under the influence of their religion instead of lapsing into atheism, the answer is obvious, that the interests of society no less require the same care of the Christian *community*. In point of principle there is no distinction, and the attempt to draw it appears to rest upon a mistaken analogy.

In England, where there is an Established Church—established mainly through royal encouragement and endowments—the Government has no occasion to provide the means of reli-

gion, except for those whom the public service, or the sentence of the law, withdraws from the ordinary opportunities. It provides for soldiers and sailors, but not for civil and political servants; it has chaplains in workhouses and prisons, but not in Downing-street or Whitehall. This precedent does not justify the Indian Government in providing clergymen for all classes receiving its pay, and leaving all the rest of their fellow-Christians without provision, in a land where the public endowments are wholly in the possession of the heathen.

In England, again, the Government has no revenue but what is drawn from the taxes, which by our constitution are expended under the control of the people. But in India, the natives have no voice either in assessing or expending the revenue, which in fact partakes more of the nature of rents and royalties, than of taxes. As a wider latitude is allowed, so greater responsibilities appertain to proprietors than to mere administrations. Nothing wrong or unjust should be attempted by either; but it is the conscience of the owner that decides in the one case, and of the people in the other. Would it be unjust to the other tenants to provide for the spiritual wants of those who profess the religion of Government? that is the question.

After a long protection of idolatry, the Directors have been suddenly seized with the conviction that neutrality to every form of religion is the only consistent policy. But where in all the world—save perhaps in some of the United States of America—is such a 'principle' to be discovered? And is a young and vigorous republic, where Government is of small account in any thing, to furnish precedents for oriental monarchies, where the sovereign owns every foot of the soil, and centuries of despotism have taught the abject millions to regard the State as the impersonation of power? If the practice of European monarchies be any rule, it would be nearer the truth to say that Government is bound to provide for all the religions of their Indian subjects, rather than to disregard them all. In fact, Mahomedanism and idolatry are cared for. The means of worship have been provided by former Governments in sufficient abundance for all their votaries, and no one proposes to disturb these endowments. Christianity alone is destitute; it would be but even-handed justice to admit her to similar advantages.

There remains one objection to be encountered, but that has been disposed of years ago.

'Apprehensions as to the consequences of Government interfering to afford facilities for the instruction of natives in the Christian religion appear to be felt by distinguished persons in India, better acquainted with the feelings of the people here than residents in England can be.'—*Analysis*, p. 122.

This is the old story. We heard the same when the first bishopric was established, when the missionaries were introduced, when the practice of Suttee was abolished, when the discontinuance of Government idolatry was insisted upon. In short, whenever any improvement in religion or education has been suggested, this was the uniform cry. Sir James Melvill admits that these apprehensions on former occasions have not been justified by experience. No disturbance at any time has been caused by missionaries or Christian institutions; while some of 'these distinguished persons in India' have more than once (as at Vellore) provoked rebellion by their ignorance or disregard of native prejudices. Why should any one imagine a class, which has been invariably wrong on former occasions, likely to be now better informed than the missionaries who have lived among the people, and known how to convert 100,000 to Christianity, without any of the predicted evils ensuing?

An 'apprehension' of this sort was exhibited not long ago among some of the native inhabitants of Madras, and the 'distinguished persons' made the most of it against the introduction of the Bible into the Government schools. But Mr. Tucker, who was in Madras at the time, and passed through the mob in his palanquin (being perfectly well known), tells us that—

'In that, as in other cases also, it was simply a European movement, urging on and exciting the natives to hold those meetings. . . . . The natives never would have troubled themselves about it.'—*Lords' Committee, Qu.* 8,290.

No, nor about the other questions of 'civil and religious liberty,' on which their 'distinguished' patrons are so anxious to get up a little rebellion. The native conscience is differently constituted. He is strongly wedded to his own religious rites; but he has no objection—quite the contrary—to persons of other religions enjoying theirs. He does not think that truth is one, and every creed not agreeing with his own an enemy to be put down. Neither does he calculate that the expenditure of Government comes out of his pocket, and feel aggrieved by all they contribute to other religions. He would be much in the wrong if he did. Let the public revenues be spent how they may, it makes no difference to his assessment; and his religious feelings are gratified—not wounded—when he sees the Government honouring its own faith, and providing temples and priests for the worship of the European's God.

The fallacy lies in this: the Directors do not distinguish between Government agency, and Government aid; nor between 'conversion' and the care of those who are already converted to Christianity. We agree with Bishop Heber in not wishing the Company's Government to engage in the work of proselytism.

They have no commission for it, and they would probably do more harm than good by attempting it. But that is no reason why the Imperial legislature should not appropriate some portion of the Indian revenues to the support of Christianity by means of other agencies. We have established Supreme Courts of Judicature to administer the English laws; and we may equally establish Bishops, with all that is requisite to the efficiency of their office, not to superintend the Company's chaplains merely, but to plant and propagate the English Church, independently of the political administration.

No objection then can be maintained, on the score of principle or expediency, to the erection of Chapters, in each of the presidencies, at the public charge; and we believe that such institutions would be eminently beneficial in sustaining the episcopal office, and supplying the means of ecclesiastical administration. Their constitution comes next to be considered.

It must be borne in mind, that in the presidency towns the Court of Directors do not at present observe their own principle. They have two chaplains at each cathedral, and others in other churches, whose position and duties are much the same with parochial clergymen's in England. If we except the garrison chaplain, there appears no reason why the Presidency Clergy should be under the orders of Government at all. We propose, therefore, that the salaries now allotted to such chaplains should be converted into the endowment of the cathedral chapter, and that the Canons should undertake the parochial charge of the Presidency towns. In other words (reserving the garrison chaplain for military duties,) we would place the Church in these towns on the same footing that it is at home, and constitute the several vicars (with the archdeacon) the cathedral chapter.[1] This would involve no additional charge on the Indian revenues: but only a slight transfer of patronage from the Directors: for the Canons should hereafter be nominated by the Bishop, and in fact would not belong to the 'Company's Service.'

We need not stop to point out the manifold uses of a capitular body in each of the Indian dioceses. One important duty would be the management of the Church Jaghires. Another, the custody of all consecrated churches and graveyards, which should be transferred from their present unsatisfactory footing to the care of the Bishop and Chapter; without prejudice, of course, to their use as at present by the chaplains and missionaries. A repair fund should be annexed to each by their present proprietors: and the Chapter would appoint a scale of fees to provide the necessary establishment of servants. Another

[1] It might be kept open to the Church Societies and others to found additional stalls.

would be the trusteeship of subscriptions in aid of new churches. These we have known commenced at different stations, and not proving immediately adequate to the object in view, the sums collected have remained in private hands, with no security for their due appropriation.

The consistency and weight which such chapters might lend to every exercise of episcopal authority, would go far to supply all that is lacking to the moral support of the Bishop, and add enormously to his efficiency in planting and extending the Church. One of their first efforts doubtless would be to meet a want complained of by all who have experience in either department of Indian labour, viz. an appropriate and consistent system of ecclesiastical discipline. This would suggest and require a revised body of local *Canons*, which again would necessitate some synodical action: and there we must leave them, while we turn our attention to the remaining portions of the subject before ourselves.

We have discussed this first division at greater length, because in India, as elsewhere, the reform of the Episcopate is the reform of the Church; and also because we have thus disposed of the principal objections encountered at the other stages of the great Christian argument. We now proceed to the remainder of the propositions placed before Parliament on behalf of the Church.

That the present number of Government Chaplains is not adequate to the purposes for which they are appointed, is undeniable. It does not even suffice for the spiritual necessities of the Government servants, according to the principle laid down by the Directors. It is found that on an average one-fourth of the whole number is ordinarily non-efficient, through absence, sickness, and death. Hence the recognised Chaplains' Stations are frequently unfilled; while it must be obvious from what has been already stated that their outlying districts are too extensive. The Station we have referred to was always allowed two Chaplains, and latterly three; yet for nearly two years the whole duties (besides the little Mission) were devolved upon one, comprising three services with sermons every Sunday in the church, two other similar services in the week, and at the least four lectures in as many military hospitals, besides attending to the sick, the schools, and the very oppressive duty at the burial-ground, for the largest European cantonment in the Presidency. We need hardly say that the district was left unvisited for much of that time. Yet the evil is vast which results from the long periods during which civil and military officers at the outstations are left without the visits of a Chaplain. If the principal person is not religiously disposed, the Lord's-day passes without the usual *recognition of* assembling for prayers read by one of themselves:

and not seldom much mischief ensues from the opposite cause. Officers in such remote situations, when affected, as they often are, with very strong views of religion, are naturally dissatisfied with so meagre an allowance of spiritual privileges, and seek to enlarge it by unauthorised ministrations. Instead of reading the liturgy with a sermon supplied by the chaplain, they will turn preachers themselves, or seek the aid of dissenting Missionaries. We have even known a military officer presume to administer the Lord's Supper, alleging (with perfect truth) that twice a-year was not a sufficient supply of that holy sacrament, and adding that in the absence of the clergy the laity must help themselves![1] Hence a melancholy amount of disorder becomes added to the spiritual destitution of India. Our readers may often have remarked how many of the Company's servants on returning from India join the sect of the Plymouth Brethren.

Against such representations the Directors plead, of course, the expense, and the augmentations actually made in late years to their Ecclesiastical Establishment. But as the last augmentation was accompanied by a graduated scale of salaries and a general reduction of furlough and retiring allowances, we question whether, in the long run, the revenue will not prove a gainer by the transaction. Certainly the Ecclesiastical Establishments are not yet placed on an equal footing with the other departments of Government. During the time our friend was sole chaplain at ——, the medical staff of the station was as follows: Superintending surgeon, Garrison surgeon, Civil surgeon, two surgeons to each of the European regiments and the artillery, and one apiece to five native regiments; making (besides young assistant surgeons occasionally doing duty, and a brigade of apothecaries, native dressers, &c.) fourteen commissioned officers for the care of the sick; while the spiritual care both of sick and whole was entrusted to one. It may be added that every station, however small, has its medical officer; while chaplains are only to be found at a few. The total charge of the ecclesiastical establishments throughout India, including the Kirk and the Roman Catholic Church, is stated at 104,816*l.*, a sum not equivalent to the cost of the Supreme Court of Judicature at Calcutta alone.[2]

[1] For this liberty he affirmed he had the warrant of a large number of 'Evangelical' clergymen in England and Ireland, who had subscribed a paper to the effect that in such cases pious laymen were allowed to administer the 'ordinance' themselves. Among the names stated to be affixed to this 'letter of marque,' was that of one who has since been elevated to the Irish mitre. As might be expected, the officer continued the exercise of his 'Christian liberty' after he had removed into the chaplain's station.

[2] 'Charges of the Queen's Supreme Court and the other local Courts within its jurisdiction, including law charges (1842-3), *Co.'s Rupees*, 11, 13, 658.' *See Accounts printed by House of Commons, 10th June*, 1845, No. 362. The total

The Bishop of Calcutta is so impressed with the necessity for more chaplains that he has advised a further reduction of salaries to obtain it. But the Indian Exchequer cannot be said to have yet disbursed its due proportion on this account, and any further reduction of salaries is much to be deprecated. At present, Mr. Keane, who was not a chaplain himself, says, 'I think a chaplain the worst paid covenanted servant in the East Indies.' ('Lords' Comm.' *Qu.* 7,938.) Lord Ellenborough would contrast them with clergymen in this country. He might as well contrast the Governor General, receiving his 30,000*l.* a-year, with the President of the India Board in London, receiving 5,000*l.* The true contrast is with the corresponding ranks in the Indian services, and this unquestionably is against the chaplain. An assistant chaplain's stipend is less than a Bengal pilot's. Many civil, military, and medical officers, whose position according to the usages of society is below the clergyman's, exceed him in emolument; and it should be remembered, that while these have staff appointments and high promotion to look to in addition, the clergy have nothing but their stipends. Then they are *resident* functionaries, expected to show hospitality to new comers. In short, Mr. Keane declares that a missionary, with many wants supplied by the Society, voyages home of wife and children paid for, and not liable to the same Indian expenditure, is, 'generally speaking, a more independent man.' He thinks the character of the Establishment has suffered from the late reductions.

'The higher motive of missionary usefulness in a heathen land, which would call forth the ablest men, is not now put before the chaplains. The ecclesiastical establishment seems paid too little, or all the other services far too much.'—*Ibid. Qu.* 7,945.

We trust, therefore, that no further reductions will be thought of. At a time when it is proposed to raise still higher the intellectual character of the other services, by introducing public competition into the disposal of writerships and cadetcies, it is of the utmost importance not to let the chaplains fall into contempt. We need say no more, however, on this subject, both because the Directors are not at all indisposed to its fair and liberal consideration;[1] and because the adoption of our other propositions would to a great extent supersede the necessity for augmenting their Establishments.

---

revenues of India exceed seventeen millions, while the total expenses of Government in the country (exclusive of interest on debt) is about fourteen and a half millions, English money.

[1] It is impossible for any Government to be more fair and impartial to its servants of every description than the Court of Directors. If no masters were ever better served, it is equally true that no servants ever possessed kinder or more liberal employers.

We come next to the suggestion of 'grants-in-aid towards the support of clergymen in the smaller English stations;' and to the recommendation of 'Native sub-assistant chaplains to minister to Native Christians connected with the Honourable Company's service.' Taking these propositions together, we must again object to the principle, implied in the latter, of distinguishing between the Company's servants and the rest of the Christian community.

The thing to be arrived at—and arrived at, as we think, more directly and systematically—is the constitution of a local Church. This is obviously uppermost in the thoughts of the least prejudiced witnesses. Mr. Keane says,—

'I long to see India do something herself to perpetuate religious principles among the people. *I think there are ample opportunities for a local Church.*'—*Ibid. Qu.* 7,946.

He conceives that,—

'the chaplains ought to go to places where the Company's servants *exclusively* reside, and that the large town congregations should be provided with clergymen paid by themselves. . . . In some instances *endowments* exist or could be found.'—*Ibid.*

We regret to find views so nearly in accordance with our own, crossed by the suggestion to provide for the clergy from 'large fees, minister's money, and pew rents.' These are in no degree better suited to India than to England. Moderate fees upon marriages and burials would be right; but let us hear little of 'minister's money,' fluctuating with the fluctuations of the community, and nothing of pew-rents. Endowments are the only proper course; comprising annual payments, till the end is accomplished, but aiming ultimately and steadily at a fixed property in land. This is the system on which the Government aid should be granted both to bishoprics and vicarages; and no doubt it might be largely assisted, under proper Church regulations, by the resident Europeans.

But to return. Mr. Tucker also points out the necessity for a local church among the Natives. The distinction between pastoral and missionary labour has long forced itself on reflecting minds. A large portion of the Missions have now grown into the parochial condition, where the missionary (as he is still called) has enough to employ his whole time in the care of the Christian village, without attempting further aggressions on the heathen. This has led to the distinction we have just named. The Church Missionary Society is setting out 'pastoral districts' in Tinnevelly, which they wish to assign to Native clergymen under the general superintendence of the European Missionary of the district; and they have actually commenced making provision for their endowment:—

'It is our aim to carry out the pastoral system as far as we can, until we

are able to withdraw from Tinnevelly, *as not being any longer a sphere for missionary labour, and leave it with the Bishop as a Church to be carried on, in all its operations, in the way in which the Church of England is.*'—*Ibid. Qu.* 8,253.

The Missions of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel present of course similar features, though we are not aware that that Society has yet distinctly contemplated any change of system.

We said at the outset of this article, that each of the three Indian organizations of the Church of England contains in itself a genuine Church idea, though none has yet systematically developed it, or sought to unite it with the others. The ideas, then, are plainly these—the English Church—the Native Church—and the Missionary Church. These genuine ecclesiastical aspects,—now obscured by the false distinction between Government servants and others,—must henceforth assume their true prominence under the Bishop and his Chapter.

The first will be embodied by the English vicarages and chaplaincies, the latter being indeed peculiar to government servants, but to such portions only as from frequent change of abode cannot conveniently be parochialized. The last is the chosen province of the Church Missionary Society. Let the middle place be appropriated to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel; who, in devoting themselves to the conversion of the Christian villages into parishes, and founding others for the mixed populations of the out-stations, where no chaplain is resident, would possess an irresistible claim to assistance from the Indian revenues. It has been shown both that the proportion allotted to ecclesiastical uses is inadequate, on the principle admitted by the Court of Directors; and that this principle fails to meet their real obligations under the Charter, and the moral responsibilities of Christian governments.[1] Some saving would result from the transfer of the churches and their establishments to the management of the Chapters, as also from replacing the presidency chaplains by vicars, whose endowment would be largely assisted by the inhabitants. The travelling charges also of the chaplains would be diminished by the founding of up-country parishes. So that on every account an abundant claim would exist on the Government to aid in the proposed foundations,—at once providing for duties long neglected, and placing recognised obligations on a more satisfactory footing.

[1] The Indian Government might very possibly consent to convert some of their principal stations up the country into English endowed vicarages, in which case the patronage should lie with them. In other cases they might assist the endowments by grants varying with the circumstances. All endowments to be finally vested in land, and their incumbents, whether bishop, archdeacon, or vicar, to be obliged to learn the Native tongue, on the same principle as ought to prevail in the Welsh dioceses.

We are satisfied that the system now sketched out will be found—the more it is reflected upon—to meet the real necessities of Christian government over a heathen land. Government agency would still be limited to the spiritual care of its own servants.[1] The conversion of the heathen would remain entrusted to organizations wholly unconnected with Government, and deriving no assistance whatever from its treasury, while there would be a third agency, not stipendiaries of the Government nor under its management, but like the heathen and Mahometan sacerdocies employing property originally bestowed by the State in the peaceable culture of an indigenous religion. Finally, all these agencies would be welded into a CHURCH, under the presidency of a canonical Bishop, enjoying, like the supreme courts of judicature, the immediate protection of the Crown and Legislature of England, and wholly devoted to the enlargement and perpetuity of the kingdom of CHRIST in India. If the Gospel be indeed a blessing to mankind, and its institutions the means of regenerating nations no less than individual souls, we know not how any government can acquit itself of its obligations to its subjects, while declining to afford them the means of embracing it. Still less when a portion of the people have been brought to choose the better way, can it be permitted to the representatives of a Christian nation to declare themselves indifferent to the fact, and in order to secure the toleration of error discourage the profession of truth.[2]

---

[1] The Chaplains, however, should be obliged to learn the Native languages, like other servants of the State.

[2] '8,256. Is there any apparent external difference between the districts inhabited by Christians and those inhabited by the heathen?—A most marked difference.

'8,257. In what respect, should you say?—In the habits of the people, in their cleanliness, order, and intelligence; our Christian villages exhibit a very striking and interesting scene, with their church and their cottages behind the rows of trees; and the people, particularly the females, exhibiting a marked difference from the heathen in the neighbourhood.

'8,258. *Earl of Ellenborough.* Do you consider that superiority to have been the cause, or the consequence of their having become Christians?—Entirely the consequence.

'8,259. They were no better than the others at first?—No better than the others, as I can bear witness in the successive visits which I have paid Tinnevelly.' —*Rev. J. Tucker,* Lords' Report. Mr. Tucker proceeds to say that a considerable effect is produced upon the social state of the surrounding heathen from the increase of Christianity. 'Devil worship, which was attended with exhibitions of a very disgraceful and shameful kind, is now thrown, so to speak, into the dark. It retreats before the influence of Christianity, where the people still remain heathen, but are ashamed of their former practices.'

Is *this* a change to which a Government can be indifferent? Why, if Christianity had only extirpated polygamy and placed the female sex in its proper position in the social scale, this alone would have earned it a right to government aid.

The subject of Native Education is too wide to be entered on at the close of an article. We mention it chiefly to extract a remark by Mr. Tucker:—

'I think it of great importance to take a thoroughly practical view of the whole subject of education, and to avoid theories, which have been perhaps injurious to the progress of education in India.'—*Ibid. Qu.* 8,306.

And again,—

'I am afraid we have hitherto aimed too high, and have not come down to the means of practically working upon the people at large.'—*Ibid. Qu.* 8,315.

This is the bane of many questions, religious and educational. The high Indian officials, with all their brilliant talent and administrative skill, are often merciless *doctrinaires*. Each has his hobby, and rides it to the death. [1] One system is promulgated at Calcutta, which, coming from the seat of supreme Government, expects to be received everywhere else. But as at Madras they have hit upon a much better system, the subordinate government declines to adopt the other, and is not allowed to carry out its own.

It is the axiom of the *doctrinaires*, that 'perfect neutrality' is to be observed by Government towards all religions; and to assert this principle, they polish up the heathen rights of conscience to a surface never imagined by the heathen themselves. The Christian Scriptures must be rigidly excluded from the Government schools, though the Hindoo Rajahs of Travancore and Mysore freely sanction their introduction into schools supported by themselves; and the opinion of the native public is unequivocally demonstrated by the fact, that while the Government schools muster throughout India 25,362 scholars, the Mission schools, where the Scriptures are not only read but avowedly used as an instrument for conversion, number 96,177.

After all, too, this affected neutrality is a mere phantom. To preserve a show of it towards the heathen, the consciences of the 100,000 native Christians are disregarded without scruple, and their children, in consequence, excluded from the Government education. Yet to the heathen themselves it is impossible to impart *any* social education, even on secular subjects, without undermining and disproving their religious tenets. It is well known that the Hindoo sacred books contain a system of physics which can no more endure the light of science than their morals can that of the Gospel. Still the one as well as the other

[1] Perhaps it is a consequence of this error in education that Mr. Keane tells us several civilians have expressed to him the opinion that '*high-flown European education* is not the best preparation for useful service in the State,' 'the airs of mere highly-taught students' being 'as much above, as their qualifications are below, the practical standard of Government employ.'

are essential elements of their religion. Our *doctrinaires*, however, have no remorse in exposing the false astronomy of the Vedas, their geography, chemistry, botany, anatomy, or physiology. It is their spiritual nakedness only that they are so anxious to cover with the mantle of toleration. They have no objection, for instance, to demonstrate to the Hindoo medical student that the human heart does not contain (as the Vedas assert it does) a little mannikin of a thumb's length, which is the whole man in miniature, and goes out at his death by the artery called Shusamna; or that there are not 'a hundred and one arteries issuing from the heart, one of which passes to the crown of the head.' To explode all this is consistent with official 'neutrality.' It is violated only when the truth is suggested, or even brought within reach, that the human being *is* endowed with an immortal spirit responsible to its Almighty Maker, and destined to stand in judgment at the tribunal of His Son. To destroy all faith in Hindooism is permitted; to bring so much as a single stone towards the erection of a better faith in its place, is jealously prohibited. Is it surprising that such a system should be more than suspected of leading to atheism; or that warm-hearted Christians should charge its supporters with 'standing between the Natives and their eternal interests'?

The Missionaries only ask for the admission of the Scriptures into Government Schools, not as a class-book for general use, but for the study of those who choose to learn them. In this demand not only the most experienced European servants of Government, but the most enlightened Native authorities are perfectly agreed with the Missionaries. Surely it is time for the *doctrinaires* to 'move on,' and let the work of practical education go forward.

For the rest, the plan which promises best, is for Government to make grants in aid of all schools that impart a standard amount of secular education; and to transfer to India our system of Training Schools, in order to furnish a proper supply of qualified Teachers. These are deeply interesting questions, and not less so the methods employed by our Missionaries to awaken and permanently impress the native mind. But we must reluctantly defer them to another opportunity.

[Since this article was in type we have learned from *Allen's Indian Mail* that it is likely another See will be founded at Agra, and a small addition be made to the number of chaplains in the Bengal Presidency; accompanied (it is more than hinted) by the substitution of seventeen for fifteen years' service to entitle to the retiring pension. These concessions, satisfactory

so far as they go, are announced in an article full of the low and imperfect conception of the episcopal office which has too long prevailed at the India House. The authorities of that noble Establishment have often shown themselves second to no other statesmen in breadth of political views, and in courage to carry their conclusions into action. They have freed themselves, also, from many terrors and prejudices which once clouded their sagacity in matters of religion. When will they apply their wonted intelligence to realize the manifold advantages of a *genuine* Episcopate, in developing energies to which statesmen can never be indifferent, though governments and armies can neither elicit nor direct them ?]

ART. III.—*Cities and Cemeteries of Etruria.* By GEORGE DENNIS. London: John Murray. 1848.

IN these days of 'Handbooks' and easy travelling, classical inquiries are every year gaining popularity: and topics which half a century ago were confined to the antiquarian or the scholar, have now little reason to complain of the want of public sympathy, if presented in a tolerably attractive form. A happy effort of enterprise redeemed from the sleep of ages Herculaneum and Pompeii: and the genius of Bulwer, faithful to antiquity without pedantry, soon filled with glowing images of the past the tenantless mansions of the Cities of the Dead. Instantly the theme of his story fascinated the public eye. Several years afterwards the discovery of the Etruscan tombs opened a new page in the history of nations. The wonderful immunity from decay enjoyed, notwithstanding the lapse of ages, by these brilliant sepulchral portraitures of ancient civilization, entranced that numerous class of our fellow-countrymen whom every summer sends to roam over the fair domains of Tuscany and the Papal States.

We must preface that it is not our intention to delay the reader with any disquisition upon that hitherto insoluble enigma, the origin of the Etruscan race. The existing materials for such a discussion have already been exhausted in two elaborate essays in the Quarterly Review: and, since Mr. Dennis's publication, no fresh light has been thrown upon the language, the only satisfactory key to the extraction of the people. Not, however, from any want of antiquarian zeal. Independently of the three classic tongues, the Ethiopic, the Egyptian, the Arabic, the Coptic, the Chinese, the Celtic, the Basque, the Anglo-Saxon, the Teutonic and the Runic have been ransacked in vain. We have, however, every expectation of enlightenment from a chapter on 'Etruria,' promised by the Chevalier Bunsen, in his forthcoming work upon the 'Philosophy of Languages.' The latest results of comparative philology upon this mysterious question will be there collectively reviewed; including, we believe, the results of Dr. Freund's recent mission from the Berlin Academy of Science to Rhætia, in the course of which he discovered from 1,000 to 1,500 words irreducible to Celtic, Germanic, or Romaic roots. The adoption of this branch of research by a scholar of European celebrity will be hailed as a happy augury of success by the lovers of Etruscan

antiquity; and we shall hope to present to our readers the fruits of his Excellency's learned labours, as soon as they issue from the press.

Mrs. Hamilton Gray's contributions to the study of Etruscan Archæology undoubtedly deserved their popularity. That lady had the merit of introducing Etruria to the notice of English travellers, and of lending fascination, by the graces of a lively and imaginative style, to a subject unattractive to the general reader. But the value of her labours to the learned world was impaired by numerous defects, both positive and negative, which it has been the task of a subsequent author to remedy and supply. Want of sound scholarship and research threw her unreservedly open to the strong Transalpine prejudices of the Italian literati, to whose bigoted dictates she passively surrendered; her inquiries, too, were partial in their scope: many sites of high interest she left untouched: to say nothing of the later discoveries at Veii, Vetulonia, and Sovana, which we shall presently describe, and which invest Mr. Dennis's pages with attractions of their own. Many of her descriptions were written, not from notes registered on the spot, but from memory, by her own fireside, and can plead no exemption from inaccuracy,[1] the usual fate of such performances. Unfamiliar, too, with classical usages and manners, she is frequently by no means a reliable interpreter of scenes depicted on the walls of those venerable tombs. An instance of this occurs in her delineation of the Grotta Querciola at Tarquinii, where, in spite of the evident amorous *abandon* of a fair Etruscan reclining on the festive couch, marking the *hetæra* to the scholar's eye, Mrs. Gray discerns in the figure only 'an afflicted mother consoled by her remaining son.'

Mr. Dennis's pretensions to fill the vacant field are assuredly of no ordinary character. Long distinguished as a contributor to the journals of the Archæological Institute at Rome, he has combined with deep classical and antiquarian lore a gallant spirit of adventurous enterprise, and a warm sensibility to the beauties of Italian scenery, which cannot fail to recommend his brilliant panoramas to all the votaries of Nature in that glorious land. Unlike his fellow-countrymen, who rarely depart, in search of antiquities, from high-roads and beaten tracks, he emulates the classic zeal which proved fatal to Müller in Bœotia: often, as he tells us, reclining on the top of a tomb, with his body hanging half over its face, clinging for support to some projection of the rock, or some friendly bough, while he endea-

[1] Witness the plate portraying the paintings in the Grotta del Triclinio at Tarquinii, very indifferent in fidelity of outline, and incorrect in colour throughout.

vours to *feel* his way through some inscription or relief: spending whole weeks among the tombs of Tarquinii, and plunging, without even the luxury of a guide, into the lone and devious wilds of the Maremma, unappalled alike by its reputed pestilential air, and the prospect of sleepless nights and the coarsest fare in some villanous *osteria*. In his work—the fruit of several Italian tours between the years 1842 and 1847—he had at first projected the unambitious design of a Guide to those who would become personally acquainted with the extant remains of Etruscan civilization. But the reader will not regret that, in the course of execution, the author soon overstepped the modest limits of a Handbook, thereby converting his volumes into a valuable repository of classical and antiquarian knowledge; while his original aim has been redeemed by specific information on routes and conveyances, and the relative merit of inns, always depreciated in cheapness and comfort wherever the main stream of English travellers has flowed. His promised volumes on Sicily, if characterised by a similar spirit, must needs prove an acceptable supplement to the meagre lucubrations of Capt. Smith and St. Non on that unexplored yet not uninteresting region.

Independently, then, of those more recent discoveries which might fairly claim some notice at our hands, apology, we trust, can scarcely be needful for the subject of the following pages. And we shall gladly embrace the opportunity to touch upon a few salient problems of Etruscan institutions, both social and religious, which have not, perhaps, as yet met with all the attention they deserve: to indicate the actual state of knowledge and research in this province of ancient lore: and to point to the numerous veins in the vast classical mine, still fruitful in the promise of virgin ore to antiquarian enterprise and learning.

If one circumstance pleads more strongly than another in favour of the adoption of those researches by our own countrymen, it is the mercenary Vandalism so prevalent in Italy, wherever the fate of antiquities is concerned.

'If,' says Mr. Dennis, 'a relic of antiquity be convertible into cash, whether by sale or by exhibition, it meets with due attention; but when this is not the case, nobody cares to preserve it—the very terms in which it is mentioned are those of contempt—it is *il pontaccio*, or *le maraccia*, and worth nothing: though, if it can be turned to any account, however base, the most hoary antiquity will avail it nought. Stones are torn from the spots they have occupied eighteen or twenty centuries, where they served as corroborations of history, as elucidations of national customs, as evidences of long-extinct civilization, and as landmarks to the antiquary—they are torn thence for conversion to some vile purpose of domestic or general convenience. Surely governments which profess to reverence memorials of the past should put a stop to such barbarous spoliations and perversions, or the ancient ways will ere long be untraceable, save by the

Itineraries of Antoninus or Theodosius, or by the records of modern archæologists.'—Vol. i. p. 77.

We cannot, of course, expect to enlist in antiquarian and classical pursuits those among the English visitors to the Eternal City who seem determined to transplant the pleasures of Melton and Ascot to the Italian soil: whose fondest triumph it is to startle the august and solemn scene with their races and fox-hunts, 'awakening unwonted clamours among the sepulchres of the Appian Way, and the ruined aqueducts of the Campagna.' But there are not wanting among us spirits kindred to those of Layard, Fellowes, Curzon, Gell: spirits bent on venturous enterprise and exciting discovery: and only deterred by the fallacious, yet far from uncommon belief, that Italy is a country so thoroughly beaten by travellers, that it no longer offers a fair hope of novelty in research.

'Yet the truth is,' says our author, 'that vast districts of the peninsula, especially the Tuscan, Roman, and Neapolitan States, are to the archæologist a *terra incognita*. Every monument on the high roads is familiar, even to the fireside traveller; but how little is known of the bye-ways! Of the swarms of travellers who yearly traverse the country between Florence and Rome, not one in a hundred leaves the beaten track to visit objects of antiquity. Now and then an excursion is made to Chiusi; or a few may run from Civita Vecchia to Corneto, to visit the painted tombs: but not a tithe of that small number continue their route to Vulci or Toscanella—still fewer to Cosa. Parties occasionally make a picnic to the site of Veii; but, considering the proximity to Rome, the convenience of transit, and the intense interest of the spot, the number is very limited.

'The wide district on the frontiers of the Tuscan and Roman States is so rarely trodden by the foot of a traveller, even of an antiquary, that it can be no matter of surprise that relics of ancient art should exist there, utterly unknown to the world: gazed at only with stupid astonishment by the peasantry, or else more stupidly unheeded. In a country almost depopulated by malaria, inhabited only by shepherds and husbandmen, the most striking monuments may remain for ages unnoticed. Thus it was with the magnificent temples of Pæstum. Though they had reared their mighty columns to the sunbeams for at least three-and-twenty centuries, isolated in an open plain where they were visible for many a league, and standing on the sea-shore, where they must have served for ages as a landmark to the mariner; yet their very existence had been forgotten by the world, till in the middle of the last century a Neapolitan painter discovered them afresh, rescuing them from an oblivion of fifteen hundred years.'—Vol. i. p. 481.

But surely the valuable discoveries at Veii, Vetulonia, and Sovana,—all made since Mrs. Gray's visit to Etruria,—to which we will now invite the reader's attention, will supply a powerful incentive to fresh investigation.

The greater part of the land around Veii, once the mightiest of Etruscan cities, belongs to the Queen of Sardinia, who lets it out in the season to excavators, mostly dealers in antiquities at

Rome, who rifle the tombs of everything convertible into cash, and cover them in immediately with earth. The solitary tomb which remains open in this Necropolis, was discovered in the winter of 1842-3; it is the property of an antiquary renowned for his excellent taste, the Cavaliere Campana, whose well-known liberality has made it accessible to every traveller, with its relics and furniture inviolate. Its virgin fame, its unique character, its preeminent antiquity, coeval, in Cavaliere Campana's opinion, with the birth of Rome, entitle it to a more detailed notice than space will allow us for its sister tombs. The extraordinary paintings on the inner wall at once arrest the traveller's eye, to the exclusion of the vast jars and articles of bronze, lying on benches or standing on the floor.

'Were there ever,' asks Mr. Dennis, 'more strangely devised, more grotesquely designed figures? Was there ever such a harlequin scene as this? Here is a horse with legs of the most undesirable length and tenuity, chest and quarters far from meagre, but a barrel pinched in like a lady's waist. His colour is not to be told in a word—as Lord Tolumnius' chestnut colt, or Mr. Vibenna's bay gelding. His neck and forehand are red, with yellow spots—his head black—mane and tail yellow—hind-quarters and near-leg black—near fore-leg corresponding with his body, but off-legs yellow, spotted with red. His groom is in deep-red livery—that is, he is naked, and such is the colour of his skin. A boy of similar complexion bestrides the horse, and another man precedes him, bearing a hammer, or perhaps a double-headed axe, upon his shoulder; while on the croup crouches a tailless cat, parti-coloured like the steed, with one paw familiarly resting on the boy's shoulder. Another beast, similar in character, but with a dog's head, stands beneath the horse.'—Vol. i. p. 51.

Other parts of the wall are chequered with similar devices, strongly resembling the animals represented on the most archaic vases in quaintness and peculiarity of form, and probably imbued with some mystic or symbolic import; for the boys on horseback may fairly be supposed to be emblems of the passage of the soul into another state of existence, from the acknowledged prevalence of the type on cinerary urns of the later style, and the figure with the threatening hammer seemingly portrays the Etruscan Charon. It is probably one of the earliest efforts of native Etruscan art: for, though the stiffness of the figures and the rigidity of the outline forcibly remind us of Egyptian paintings, the features, unlike those in the Tarquinian sepulchres, do not present any of the peculiarities of the Coptic race: the sphinx is not Egyptian, for it is winged: and the ornamental border of lotus flowers, emblematic of immortality, is the only element in the scene suggestive of the Nile.

The relics of a city which Mr. Dennis, in common with many of the leading antiquaries at Rome, both German and Italian, identifies with the site of the lost Vetulonia, were discovered by Signor Pasquinelli, in May 1842, while he was forming a road

from Magliano to the Saline, at the mouth of the Albegna. The ground on the line of the projected route being low and swampy, and the higher land being a soft friable tufa, the engineer was at a loss for materials, till he chanced to uncover some large blocks beneath the surface, easily recognised as the foundations of an ancient wall. He found them range in an unbroken line, which readily enabled him to trace out the periphery of a city between four and five miles in circuit. The site was evidently Etruscan, for neither statues nor marble columns, as among Roman ruins, were discovered: but the relics were chiefly bronze and pottery, especially the common black ware of Chiusi and Volterra: among others, a lion of *peperino*, a little bronze idol with a sickle in his hand, all of the most archaic style, and a venerable packing needle, with eye and point uninjured, which had possibly served some Etruscan worthy in preparing for his travels to the Fanum Voltumnæ, the Parliament of the Lucumones. The characteristics of the site certainly correspond with the requisites of the classic Vetulonia far more closely than Castiglione Bernardi, the spot assigned by Inghirami and Ambrosch, fourteen or fifteen miles from the sea. It is described by the writers of antiquity, and especially by Silius Italicus, as a city of great power and magnificence, with strong claims to rank among the Twelve: with hot springs in its neighbourhood, which Mr. Dennis thinks he has recognised in those at Telamonaccio, two or three hundred yards only from the sea. And, above all, its maritime character, implied by Pliny, and established by a monument,[1] discovered at Cervetri, in 1840, harmonises with the position of the ruins on the first heights that rise above the level of the marine swamp, nearly at the same distance from the port of Telamone as Tarquinii lies from its harbour Graviscæ—a position which indicates a compromise between security and convenience: for, apart from maritime purposes, the founders would surely have built further inland, at once for the sake of a stronger site, and for greater elevation above the insalubrious atmosphere of the Maremma.

Several painted tombs have been opened in the neighbour-

[1] A bas-relief, bearing the devices of three Etruscan cities—Tarquinii, Vulci, and Vetulonia. The latter, which is indicated by the inscription, *Vetulonenses*, is symbolised by a naked man with an oar on his shoulder, and holding a pine-cone, which he seems to have just plucked from a tree over his head. Dr. Braun, the learned Secretary of the Archæological Institute, says—'That this figure represents Neptune, seems to me beyond a doubt; it is shown not only by the attribute in his hand, but also by the tree, sacred to that Deity, which stands at his side. However this may be, no one can presume to deny that the figure bearing an oar indicates a maritime city, such as Pliny in truth implies Vetulonia to have been. —*Dennis*, vol. i. p. 303.

hood, and, as usual, have since been re-closed with earth, when once rifled of their treasures. There is, doubtless, much to invite excavators to the spot.

The accidental discovery of the sepulchral curiosities at Sovana, and of the relics imbedded for ages in the Lake of Falterona, near Florence, only multiply the inducements to further research. The former were disclosed to the antiquarian world in the spring of 1842, by Mr. Ainsley, our author's enterprising fellow-traveller, who, on exploring the surrounding ravines, detected a long range of tombs with rock-hewn façades like those of Norchia and Castel d'Asso: only that they were unique in combining the characteristics of remote ages and countries — of Egypt, Greece, Etruria and Rome — with a prodigal variety elsewhere unknown. The novel and striking features peculiar to the site invest the discovery with special interest and importance; but we will not fatigue the reader with their details, which are fully developed in the twenty-sixth chapter of Mr. Dennis's first volume. It is, however, only fair to warn him of the perils which the traveller must encounter in a visit to the spot. So dense are the tangled thickets that Mr. Ainsley was compelled to get the peasants to pioneer him a way from one monument to another with their wood-bills: the slopes are furrowed with yawning pits: and the ground is kept moist and slippery with the overhanging foliage, so that a false step would, in a double sense, prove a step into the grave. But a subtler foe lurks in the *malaria*, which year by year stalks through this skeleton of former greatness. Along its silent street reigns a monotonous death-like calm: its houses are mostly ruined and tenantless: even on a fête-day, during the healthy season, scarcely a soul, says Mr. Dennis, was visible, and the few who met his eye had hardly energy even for wonder at the novel apparition of a stranger.

But perhaps the most singular discovery was that made in the summer of 1838, in the Lake of Monte Falterona, one of the loftiest of the Tuscan mountains, whence the Arno takes its rise, and from whose summit, says Ariosto, both seas are visible. Here we must allow our author to tell his own story:—

'On the same level with the source of the Arno is a lake, on whose banks a shepherdess, sauntering in dreamy mood, chanced to cast her eye on something sticking in the soil. It proved to be a little figure in bronze. She carried it home: and taking it in her simplicity for the image of some holy man of God, set it up in her hut to aid her private devotions. The parish priest, paying a pastoral visit, observed this mannikin, and inquired what it was. "A saint," replied the girl; but, incredulous of its sanctity, he carried it away with him. The fact got wind in the neighbourhood of Stia del Casentino, and some of the inhabitants agreed to make researches on the spot. A single day sufficed to bring to light a quantity of such

images and other articles in bronze, lying confusedly on the shores of the lake, just beneath the surface. They then proceeded to drain the lake, and discovered in its bed a prodigious quantity of trunks of fir and beech trees, with their roots uppermost, as if they had been overthrown by some mighty convulsion of nature; and on them lay many similar figures in bronze. They were mostly human figures of both sexes, many of them of gods and penates, varying in size from two or three to seventeen inches in height. But how came they here? was the question which puzzled every one to answer. At first, it was thought they had been cast into the lake for preservation, during some political convulsion, or invasion, and afterwards forgotten. But further examination proved them to be chiefly of a votive character—offerings at some shrine, for favours expected or received. Most of them had their arms extended, as if in the act of presenting gifts; others were clearly representations of beings suffering from disease, especially one who had a wound in his chest, and a frame wasted by consumption or atrophy: and there were, moreover, a number of decided *ex-votos*—heads and limbs and various portions of the human body: beside many images of domestic animals, also of a votive character. All this implied the existence of a shrine on the mountain, surrounded, as the trees seemed to indicate, by a sacred grove, like that of Feronia or Soracte, and of Silvanus at Cære; and it seemed that, by one of those terrible convulsions to which this land has from age to age been subject, the shrine and grove had been hurled down into this cavity of the mountain. It is well known that such catastrophes have in past ages occurred in Monte Falterona. No traces, however, of a shrine, or of any habitation, were discovered with the relics in this lake. . . . . There were some articles of very different character mixed with these figures, the existence of which, on such a site, was still more difficult to explain. Such were fragments of knives and swords, and the heads of darts, all of iron, in great numbers, not less, it is said, than two thousand; besides great chains, and *fibulæ*, with fragments of the better known coinage.'—Vol. ii. pp. 109, 110.

We are indebted to the author for the following account of the solution of this mystery, proposed by Dr. Emil Braun, the learned Secretary of the Archæological Institute at Rome:—

'He (Dr. Braun) observes that the trees found in the lake had been completely deprived of vitality, the water having absorbed all the resinous parts which they possessed when green. He considers that the convulsion or dislocation of the mountain, which hurled them into this spot, must have occurred long prior to the period when the bronzes and other articles were here deposited, otherwise the latter would have been buried beneath the former, and not regularly set around the lake. He thinks that the lake was formed at the time when the landslip occurred, and that its waters acquired a medicinal quality from the trees it contained, the parts which gave them that virtue being identical with those from which modern chemistry extracts creosote. Now, the diseases which are shown in the *ex-votos* are just such, he observes, as are remediable by that medicine. The styptic water of Pinelli, so celebrated for stopping the hæmorrhage of recent wounds, has a base of creosote; and hither, it seems, flocked crowds of wounded warriors, who left their weapons in acknowledgment of their cure. The virtues of the same medicine, in curing the attacks of phthysis, e now recognised by medical men of every school; and by patients ouring under this disorder the lake seems to have been especially quented. Creosote also is a specific against numerous diseases to which e fair sex is subject: and such appear, from the figures, to have resorted

in crowds to these waters. To free his theory from the charge of caprice or fantasy, the learned doctor cites the case of a similar lake in China, which is known to have imbibed marvellous medicinal qualities from the trunks of trees casually immersed in its waters.'—Vol. ii. p. 112.

The bronzes thus discovered, several of which are now open to inspection in the British Museum,[1] illustrate the manifold variations of Etruscan art, from the rude efforts of its infancy to the era of perfection under Greek influence.

But one of the most singular monuments of antiquity—the tomb of Porsena, has yet to be reclaimed. It is the only Etruscan sepulchre described by any classical writer, and is thus portrayed in Pliny's quotation from Varro:—

'Porsena was buried under the city of Clusium, in a spot where he has left a monument in rectangular masonry, each side whereof is three hundred feet wide, and fifty high, and within the square of the basement is an inextricable labyrinth, out of which no one who ventures in without a clue of thread can ever find an exit. On that square basement stand five pyramids, four at the angles, and one in the centre, each seventy-five feet wide at its base, and one hundred and fifty high, and all terminating above so as to support a brazen circle and a *petasus*, from which are hung by chains certain bells, which, when stirred by the wind, resound afar, as was formerly the case at Dodona. Upon this circle four other pyramids are based, each rising to the height of one hundred feet. And above these, from one floor, five more pyramids, whose height Varro was ashamed to mention. Etruscan legends declare it to have been equal to that of the rest of the edifice. What insane extravagance, to hunt for glory at a lavish expense that can profit no man!'

The reader will hardly require to be told that the whole story was immediately condemned by Niebuhr as a shadowy illusion—'a building totally inconceivable, save as the work of magic'—a visionary phantom, like Aladdin's palace. Müller, on the contrary, argues that the precision of Varro's statement betrays a more reliable source than mere tradition: and Orioli, adopting with Mr. Dennis a more reasonable ground of criticism, and refusing to believe that 'a monument could have been traditional had it not been characteristic,' infers that Varro's description must not only have been consonant with the Etruscan style of architecture, but drawn from a real object, just as the ideal palaces of Ariosto and Tasso had evidently their Italian originals. Apart from the legitimate presumption that a magnificent tomb was raised to the majestic shade of

[1] This institution is rich in the monuments of Egypt and Assyria, but poor in its collection of Etruscan relics. The Vase room is the best, but the bronze department is a very hungry affair: we see no specimens of the exquisite jewellery and gold filagree-work, which in foreign Museums are still the pride of Etruria. And the fac-similes of sepulchral paintings are very partial, exhibiting, with only one exception, convivial and athletic scenes, to the exclusion of all others.

Lars Porsena, whose prestige inspired terror even into Rome, and that the site of such a monument would naturally be Clusium, his capital, it is surely no vain credulity to repose with our author on the argument from analogy. He remarks that the square basement of regular masonry, supporting five pyramids, exists not only in the Varronian picture, but in the well-known sepulchre on the Appian Way at Albano; and that the Cucumella of Vulci, with its walled basement and pair of towers, square and conical, and its Lydian cousin, the Royal tomb of Sardis, with its diadem of five termini, though both have a circular basement, bear a strong affinity to the legendary monument. But the distinguishing feature of Porsena's tomb was the Labyrinth, numerous analogies to which are presented by existing relics. Situated within the basement, it was probably subterranean,[1] and also excavated in the rock, so that traces of it would not be easily effaced. A few years ago many antiquaries imagined they had revealed it to the world in the excavations made on the hill Poggio Gabella, about three miles to the north-east of Chiusi, which proved to be an isolated City of the Dead; characterised not only by the ordinary fence of walls and fosse, the decorations and furniture of the living in the abodes of the departed, and distinct lines of terraces, but by an extraordinary net-work of labyrinthine passages, meandering in tortuous channels with the most capricious irregularity both of height, form, breadth and level. Inability to surmise the design of these mysterious alleys ought not to induce us hastily to identify the hill with the site of the long-lost tomb. Several circumstances point to an opposite conclusion. The fact that one of the passages opens just beneath the ceiling, destroying the beauty of the walls, which were painted with dancing figures, and that another cuts through one of the rock-hewn couches; their extreme tenuity, which makes it difficult to thread them on all-fours, and their manifold irregularities, especially of level, seem to authenticate the suspicion that they were mostly formed in bygone researches for concealed treasure. The chips of broken pottery and urns, and the condition in which the magnificent Vase of the Judgment of Paris, now the gem of the Casuccini Collection, was found, broken into a hundred and twenty minute fragments, clearly betray the violations past ages have witnessed in the tomb. The inference is strengthened by the discrepancy of the basement, circular instead of square; and the comparatively late date of its decorations and contents conspires to argue a less ambitious origin for these chambers of

[1] We beg pardon of Mrs. H. Gray, who summarily decides that it *must* have been above ground, and that this was the reason of the disappearance of the monument.

the dead. But the votaries of classical research will do well to explore the recesses of another hill, called Poggio di San Paoli, not far off, long marked by tradition as the depository of ancient treasure, and by fragments of massive masonry as the basement of a sepulchral tumulus. We trust to their energy to overcome the scruples entertained against excavation by its present proprietor, one of the Canons: who perhaps may still catch the spirit of those members of his own Church, under whose auspices fresh investigations into the remnants of Italian antiquity have lately been undertaken at Rome.

In one who has devoted so many years of patient and enterprising research to the elucidation of a favourite subject, casual excesses of enthusiasm are assuredly a pardonable fault. But the zeal with which he labours to elevate his darling Etruria in the scale of nations cannot excuse the invidious depreciation of her mighty conqueror, implied by the author's assertion that Rome, before her intercourse with Greece, 'was indebted to 'Etruria for almost everything which tended to exalt her as a 'nation, save her stern virtues, her love of conquest, her in-'domitable courage, which were peculiarly her own; *for verily* '*her sons were mighty with little else than the sword:*'—

——— Stolidum genus
Bellipotentes magi quàm sapientipotentes.

Nothing can be a more vulgar or superficial error than that conceived in the words we have italicised. Doubtless, the Roman character, in common with that of the noblest races of antiquity, was clearly—may we not say, providentially?—impressed with a distinct and peculiar type. Indeed, the more strongly-defined characteristics of ancient nationality may safely be ranked among the salient points of contrast between ancient and modern civilization. But Mr. Dennis entirely mistakes the idiosyncrasy of Rome. Though almost every inch of her vast territory was won by the sword, consolidation was with her ever a more important task than aggrandizement; if she appropriated by conquest, she gave fixity by legislation: she incorporated the whole framework of civilized antiquity by a communion of laws, language, and institutions; and she has left an immortal legacy to the nations of Europe in her civil code, which survived alike the crash of the imperial system, and the anarchical turbulence of barbarism, to form the common law of almost every continental state, and, by the tardy confession of our ablest lawyers,[1] to constitute by far the most valuable

[1] The vast obligations of our Chancery system, and, in some degree, of our Common Law, to the Roman law, have been recently illustrated in great detail in the learned work of Mr. Spence, 'On the Equitable Constitution of the Court of Chancery.' They were very inadequately acknowledged, because very imperfectly understood, by Blackstone.

portion of the equitable jurisprudence of that remote and barbarian isle—our own Britain—'which the Imperial Roman shivered as he named.'

In the same vein, alike in the teeth of antecedent probability and recorded evidence, the author claims for Etruria 'the possession of a national literature—histories, tragedies, and 'poems: besides religious and ritual books.' (Introd. lvii.) It is more than doubtful if Etruscan letters ever rose above the sober level of the Carthaginian muse, whose sole heirloom to posterity consisted of a logbook of Hanno's voyage, and a manual of practical husbandry. One solitary tragedian, Volnius, apparently a late writer, whose aim was the revival of an expiring language, redeemed from the night of oblivion by the indefatigable antiquarian Varro,[1] alone sustains the dignity of the Tuscan buskin. Polybius,[2] indeed, mentions 'Annals of the Etruscan dynasties,' but not in terms which render us inconsolable for their loss. They would hardly have been suffered to die had they been of any literary value, and would probably only have been *materials*, like the Pontifical Records, for the annals of a Greek or Roman author. The poetical fame of Etruria Mr. Dennis unhappily reposes on the Fescennine rusticities, which, however, we must believe, with Horace, quite unequal to the load: to say nothing of the circumstance which Niebuhr[3] might have taught our author, that the town from which the Fescennine dialogue took its name belonged to the Faliscans, *not* to the Etruscans. It is singular that, if Etruria was indeed a mother of poets, not a single Etruscan inscription betrays the semblance of a verse. So far from being rich in native legendary lore, such was her poverty of heroic lays, that, as we constantly observe in the scenes and devices of the painted vases, she was compelled to naturalise Greek myths. We have, however, no wish to dispute the authenticity of their 'Ritual Works:' and as little to deny the accuracy of the Roman estimate thereof, couched in the pithy sarcasm of Cato, so happily rescued by Bentley[4] from the stupid perversion of his sceptical antagonist, 'Miror quòd non rideat haruspex, haruspicem aspiciens.'

To ascertain, however, the true rank of Etruria in the scale of ancient civilization, let us briefly review the prominent features of her religion, arts, manners, and social institutions.

Few questions connected with antiquity require so delicate a discrimination; few are so pregnant with illustration at once of moral character and national affinity, as the idiosyncracies of Paganism. In what field of historical criticism has the noble

[1] De Linguâ Latinâ, v. 55. Cf. Merivale's Roman Emperors, vol. ii. p. 499.
[2] ii. 17. [3] Vol. i. p. 136, third edition.
[4] *Remarks on Freethinking*, p. 434.

spirit of the leading nations of the old world been so ignorantly condemned by the flippancy of modern conceit?—which, with habitual modesty and depth, lays to the account of sheer prejudice principles of policy founded upon the highest moral and religious grounds. A signal instance of this has lately been presented to the world in the impertinent parade of a writer, who, if he had but confined his researches to their true province, the exposition of the financial and trading arrangements of Mr. Bull, need never have compromised his fame. In his last publication,[1] Mr. J. R. M'Culloch has condescended to survey Phœnician, Greek, and Roman commerce: and informs us that the Athenians despised commercial and mechanical employments *because* they committed them to slaves; that the Roman preference of agriculture to trade was sheer bigotry; and that the solemn warnings of ancient philosophy and history against the luxury and demoralisation to which commercial states were peculiarly incident, are 'apparently lofty, but really narrow and illiberal prejudices.' We trust Mr. Mill will not fail to enlist the first of these truly learned and logical statements in the chapter on 'Fallacies' in the next edition of 'Logic, Ratiocinative and Inductive,' for we imagine it might fairly be presumed by the most illiterate that, if the Athenians committed artisanship and retail trade to slaves, it was because they disdained them as menial avocations, and not *vice versâ*. His calumnies against Roman and Athenian philosophers and statesmen admit of a very easy solution. Their encouragement of agriculture in preference to trade, as the occupation of their fellow-countrymen, was founded upon a deliberate conviction of its relative moral tendencies. That conviction was sustained by causes some of which are still in operation, while others were limited to the social system of the ancient world. The fall had introduced an element of disharmony into all the relations of man, whether to his Creator, or to his fellow-creatures. A consequence of this disharmony was the breach of the natural law of universal love and sympathy, the providential remedy for which we recognise in that partial law of association, which, while it intensified patriotism and the feeling of a common life in the members of individual states, intensified also the vital distinctions of religion, race, and law. Within a very limited geographical area, how wonderfully diversified are the customs, the institutions, the religion of the several states of Greece! No wonder that Dicæarchus found the illustration of national characteristics so fertile a theme! So strong was the tendency towards political isolation, (assisted, doubtless, but not created,

[1] Treatises on Economical Policy, by J. R. M'Culloch. Edinb. 1853.

by the physical configuration of Hellas,) that when a Greek stepped across his frontier, though he was perhaps only twenty or thirty miles from his own metropolis, he found himself in a domain where protection for life and property could only be secured him by virtue of a previous covenant, either special to himself, or shared in by the city of his birth. It was thus that Paganism—in its genius, on the one hand, of exclusion, on the other, of intense nationality within a narrow circle—in the partiality of its types and forms—offers a singular contrast to the great Catholic attribute of Christianity.

The bond of race was originally all-powerful: but the distinctions of race were not 'distinctions without a difference.' Each race adored its own Divinities: and the widely diversified attributes of those Divinities variously presented a moral or an immoral image to public veneration. What a contrast between the soft voluptuousness of the Grecian creed, the enormities of the Oriental Bacchanalia, or the mysteries of Isis, and the pure but stern theology of the Latin and Sabine ancestors of Rome! Again, civil institutions and positive law were among the ancients a very important source of public and private morality; practices held infamous in one state were encouraged by the lawgiver in another. With such antecedent probability, we need hardly quote at length the pregnant testimonies of Aristotle and Cicero to the truth, that the promiscuous influx of foreigners—inevitable in a great commercial state—with foreign institutions and foreign creeds, 'tended,' in the words of the *liberal* Dr. Arnold,[1] 'to confuse all the relations of life, and all men's notions of right and wrong,' so that the civilization which was the fruit of commerce went hand in hand with degeneracy. It is on these grounds that Aristotle[2] deprecates a maritime site for his Utopian city, while Cicero[3] ascribes the stability of Rome to her inland position, and his countrymen's agricultural tastes, in contrast with the character and fate of those great representatives of ancient trade, Carthage and Corinth, and the Isles of Greece, whose institutions and morals, he says, were as truly afloat on the waves of eternal change as the isles themselves on the waters of the Ægean.

With this necessary protest against a not uncommon confusion of the cardinal distinctions of Pagan religion into one unvarying type of Heathenism, we will enter on a brief examination of the Etruscan creed. The standards whereby it may fairly be weighed are probably the comparative clearness with which it

[1] Pref. to Thucyd. vol. iii.

[2] Pol. vii. 6. Becker. *Τὸ γὰρ ἐπιξενοῦσθαί τινας ἐν ἄλλοις τεθραμμένους νόμοις ἀσύμφορον εἶναι πρὸς τὴν εὐναυίαν καὶ τὴν πολυανθρωπίαν*, κ.τ.λ.

[3] De Republ. ii. 4.

realized the ideas of immortality, of future retribution, of the nature of good and evil, and of the moral taint of sin; also, the character and attributes of its Deities, and its influence on the manners, the art, and the general intellect of the people. The question, of course, is purely relative, and can only be discussed in connexion with other religious systems of antiquity. Our space, however, will only allow us to indulge in a very cursory review thereof.

Amid wild delusion, barbaric rites, and grotesque superstitions, the East has from the earliest ages been the repository of scattered rays of eternal truth, whose radiance, though distorted and obscured, oftentimes exhibits Oriental religion in honourable contrast with the levity of Greece. Ages before the rise of Athenian genius and the spread of Roman civilization, the great doctrines of the immortality of the soul and of a future state of rewards and punishments were acknowledged and diffused by the swarthy sages of the Nile, and the Sacerdotal Princes of Tarquinii. The Homeric conception of the dead is thoroughly unspiritual: with the relaxation of the sinews and the exhaustion of the blood are dried up at once the springs of life and the immaterial essence of the soul; shadowy phantom forms, robbed of the joys alike of sense and intellect, feebly flutter in sunless gloom on the Stygian shore. We can easily sympathise with the offer of Achilles, so strongly reprobated by Plato, to enchange the sovereignty of the realms of Hades for a menial craft on earth. The most atrocious of criminals are but pelted with the soft roses of poetical 'justice;' far from being their awarded sentence as they pass the gates of Death, their Tartarean tortures only symbolise their deeds in life. Minos is a judge amongst the Shades, *because* he was a judge among the living; and Orion chases the shadows of the beasts his darts had stricken in Ortygian groves. The perils and temptations of life were no scene of probation to the heroes of Hesiod; they were the Children of the Gods, and in right of their race divine they bask in Elysian shades. Either in the natural development of ideas, or beneath the influence of Oriental tradition, this crude philosophy was gradually refined: and the glorious imagination of Pindar aspires beyond the vague scenes of the mythical picture to the ethical conception of diversified stages of retribution and reward. Plato recognised a triple sphere of futurity, the bliss of Paradise, the woes of Tartarus, and an intermediate state, which forestalled and probably suggested the purgatory of the Romanists; and the Virgilian portraiture, both of the functions of Minos[1] and the destinies of the dead, is

[1] *Nec verò hæ sine sorte datæ, sine judice sedes:*
Quæsitor Minos urnam movet; ille silentum
Conciliumque vocat, *vitasque et crimina discit.*—Æn. vi. 429.
Cf. Hom. Od. λ'. 567.

drawn from the canvas and inspired by the genius of that master-spirit of antiquity.

The Egyptian custom of embalmment is plausibly referred by Servius to the gross materialism of the popular creed, which believed the soul to be capable of retaining its powers only while the body was preserved from decay. Hence the elaborate care with which they sought in the abodes of the dead to revive and perpetuate the scenes of life; convinced, says Diodorus, that while the realms of earth were only a temporary home, the tomb was the destined habitation of man for ages. Between this conception and the doctrine of Metempsychosis, which, according to Herodotus, emanated from Egypt, there is an obvious antipathy; but it is easily solved, on the theory that the former was the popular, the latter the philosophical idea; two elements opposed to each other in almost every form of Paganism. And who can wonder at the anomalies they engender? Who can wonder if the belief of the ancients on the future fate of the soul fluctuates with an almost Protean versatility, when, as an eminent author remarks, the licence of Christian theory, within the sphere of a definite revelation, has variously conceived the doctrine of the Millennium, that of Purgatory under its various developments, and in recent times conflicting theories on the eternity of future suffering, and the final extinction or the final restitution of the wicked? But the papyrus rolls, which are often discovered enclosed in the sarcophagi, prove that the Egyptian creed included the belief in retribution after death. They shadow forth the awful form of the infernal judgment in the realms of Amenthe, wherein the deceased addresses the forty-two arbiters of eternity; the Goddess of Truth holds in her hands the record of his life; and, if good deeds prevail therein, he rests for evermore amid scenes of Osirian bliss.

The relation of the Etruscan creed to that of the Nile is one of partial analogy and partial discrepancy. There are no traces of any struggle between the popular and the philosophical doctrine, nor any evidence of a belief in the transmigration of the soul; while the sepulchral usages evince a more elegant and refined superstition than that which dictated the embalmment of the dead. On the other hand, it is clear that Etruscan imagination never soared to the spiritual idea of immortality; the decorations and furniture of the tombs speak a belief in the sensuous essence of the soul, which even in the grave is entranced by the scenes and pleasures of life. Emotions of surprise cannot but arrest the traveller on entering the Tarquinian tombs, at an exhibition so uncongenial to his own sombre conception of death:—

'Can these scenes of feasting, of merriment,' asks Mr. Dennis, 'this *ncing, this piping*, this sporting, appertain to a tomb? There, on the

inner wall, and occupying the principal row, is a banquetting scene—figures in richly broidered garments recline on couches, feasting to the sound of lyre and pipes; attendants stand around, some replenishing the cups from the wine-jars on a side-board hard by; a train of dancers, male and female, beat time with lively steps to the notes of the instruments, on which some of them are performing; while in the lower row are depicted field sports, a boar hunt being the most conspicuous. But observe that fond and youthful pair on the central couch. The female, of exquisite beauty, turns her back upon the feast, and throws her arms passionately round the neck of her lover, who reclines behind her. The other guests quaff their wine without heeding them. The elegant forms of the couches and stools, the rich drapery, the embroidered cushions, show this to be a scene of high life, and give us some idea of Etruscan luxury.'—Vol. i. p. 282.

The startling scene presented by Campanari's garden is thus described:—

'You seem transported to some scene of Arabian romance, where the people are all turned to stone, or lie spell-bound, awaiting the touch of a magician's wand to restore them to life and activity. All round the garden, under the close-embowering shade of trellised vines, beneath the drooping boughs of the willow, the rosy bloom of the oleander, or the golden fruit of the orange and citron, forming, in fact, the borders of the flower-beds—there they lie—Lucumones of aristocratic dignity—portly matrons, bedecked with jewels—stout youths and graceful maidens—reclining on the lids of their coffins, or rather on their festal couches—meeting with fixed, stony stare, the astonishment of the stranger, yet with a distinct individuality of feature and expression, and so lifelike that each seems to be on the point of warming into existence.'—Vol. i. p. 443.

> 'Like the figures on arras that gloomily glare,
> As seen by the dying lamp's fitful light,
> Lifeless, but lifelike, and awful to sight,
> They seem through the dimness about to come down
> From the shadowy wall where their images frown.'

The ascendency which the doctrine of future retribution held over the Etruscan mind is clearly delineated by the sepulchral paintings, several of which are probably familiar to many of our readers in the illustrations of Mrs. Hamilton Gray, who copied them from the more correct and classical sketches of Micali. In consonance with the national belief which assigned to every man a good and an evil genius at his birth, the one commissioned to incite him to deeds of virtue, the other to deeds of evil, we find them portrayed in various scenes and functions, now drawing a car, upon which sits a soul shrouded with a veil, to the scene of the infernal judgment, now threatening with a heavy hammer wretched souls who are imploring mercy on their knees, now mounting guard upon the dark threshold of eternity, and pointing out the entrance with uplifted finger to some approaching spirit. Their distinctive attributes are discernible at a glance; all alike are winged, but the good are painted red or flesh-coloured, the ministers of darkness are black; the guardian

angels generally bear a wand; the malignant demon is armed with a hammer, sword, snakes, or a torch; the spirit who decrees the final judgment has a scroll, with writing implements, and sometimes a hammer and a nail, familiar to the readers of Horace as the emblems of an irrevocable doom. In the doctrine of dualism thus portrayed, and in the whole system of Etruscan demonology, Gerhard and Micali alike acknowledge the undeniable impress of the Oriental type. In Homer these subordinate divinities are scarcely recognised; in Hesiod they are uniformly good. Plutarch traces the belief in malignant demons to Egypt and Asia Minor; and it first appears in those philosophers of Greece who we know drank deeply from Oriental sources—Xenocrates, Empedocles, and Plato—in whose writings they are described as satanic and divine, and as characterised by all the intermediate shades of good and evil.

We thus find not only the conviction of the soul's eternity, and the connexion of its future happiness or misery with its career in life, but a belief in the essence of moral good and evil and the personality of spiritual agents, whose antagonism constitutes the moral contrasts of humanity, embodied in the Etruscan creed, and powerfully influencing the Etruscan imagination in all the developments and creations of art. But there are other elements of the national religion which at once distinguish it from the Hellenic faith, and connect it with an Eastern source. In their frequent ceremonial observances of expiation and lustration, they realized that idea of a special taint in crime, and of the necessity as well as sufficiency of religious ordinances for its removal, which Grote shows to have been utterly foreign to Homer's conceptions, and which Herodotus attributes to the Lydians in terms which corroborate the strong presumption of their intimate connexion by conquest or colonisation with Etruria. To Etruria Rome applied in a season of distress, Athens to the Cretan Epimenides, to conciliate an offended Providence by new orgies and rites of absolution; and the principal Hellenic mysteries and forms of expiation were confessedly of exotic, if not all of Asiatic origin: while those permanent establishments of hereditary families of priests, which arose from the exigencies under which foreign rites had been invoked, were equally at variance with the native tone of the Grecian mind (though the spontaneous growth of Egypt and Etruria) as the whole Oriental element of religious melancholy and penance, which would have been held a desecration of the primitive Hellenic festival, emphatically the season of cheerful harmony and social enjoyment. Eastern superstitions mingled with Grecian faith as the Titaresius, in the legend, *mingled* with the Peneus, without interfusing its waves: they

harmonised with the genius of Etruria as the confluence of sister streams. The religion of Hellas was the voluntary adoption of her children, stamped with the impress of Hellenic sensibility and imagination; lively, joyous, and elastic; inspiring, but not controlling, art and literature; independent of political systems, and equally susceptible of implicit faith and allegorical development: the Etruscan creed was imposed upon a subject people by the ascendency of a priestly caste, whose ritual influenced, but was not an emanation of, the national character: it was veiled in an impenetrable shroud of mystic and symbolical imagery: intolerant of every rival, it absorbed freedom, alike in all its germs and creations, whether intellectual, political, or artistic: it arrayed itself, like the Roman Catholic, in the robes of illusion, and was armed with all the prestige of ceremonial pomps and observances: it was an all-pervading principle, the leaven of society, the very atmosphere of existence.

The mystical features of the Etruscan system deserve illustration, not only because they have been exaggerated and distorted, but because they are prominent among the types of Orientalism. Among the more ordinary symbols are the Hippocampi and watersnakes, usually regarded as emblematic of the soul's passage from life to the shades of eternity—an interpretation sustained at once by the shrouded spirits and figures of boys riding on their backs, and by their amphibious character, evidently the type of a double state of existence. Dolphins, painted alternately red and black, figure among the sepulchral ornaments, and probably symbolise the maritime sceptre of Etruria; while the rolling border beneath them represents the waves, in which they are tossing and careering, as in the Virgilian picture of the shield of Æneas. But, of all Etruscan emblems, serpents are perhaps the most pregnant with a varied mystical significance. Now they are the types of health and renovation, of Apollo and Esculapius; now, the symbols of sanctity, distinguishing generally the sacred from the profane; now, the emblems of volcanic agencies and Typhonian powers; now, the instruments of terror, brandished in the hands of priests at the head of advancing hosts, and riveting the ascendency of the sacerdotal order by passively yielding to the potent fascination of soothsayers and charmers—not, however, that the veneration of the reptile was peculiar to Etruria or even to the East. But in the Etruscan symbolism of the soul, or spiritual essence, under the figure of a bird, we trace a very curious affinity to the Scriptural system of types. It is well known that the series of emblems so profusely employed by the Fathers in the exposition of Holy Writ, was handed down from

age to age by the traditions of 'the Schools of the Prophets;' and S. Augustine applies this instrument of interpretation to a difficulty in the Old Testament, doubtless with authority from ancient usage. In his version, the passage in Genesis xv., which describes Abraham, in offering a sacrifice of a heifer, a goat, a ram, a turtle-dove and a young pigeon, as leaving the birds alone undivided with his knife, is connected with a parallel in 1 Cor. iii., where S. Paul asserts that those who have built upon the foundation of Christ works of gold, silver, and precious stones, will not only be saved, but receive a reward; while those who have built upon the same foundation works of hay and stubble, shall themselves be saved, 'yet so as by fire,' while their works shall be consumed. The birds, he says, are emblematic of the first of the two classes mentioned by S. Paul; and, accordingly, Abraham does not divide *them*, because they represent the truly spiritual, between whom and their works there is no *division*.

Among other authentic emblems of Etruscan superstition are the hammer, the symbol of supernatural, generally of fiendish, power; the twisted wand, the attribute of benign divinity; the snake-bound brow, the herald of sovereignty; the fish, typifying ocean's depths; the rudder and the trident, the attributes of maritime supremacy; wings, distinguishing the spiritual from the human; and griffons, marking evil and destructive agencies.[1]

The deathbed scenes, favourite subjects in many of the tombs, often exhibit exquisite tenderness and pathos, and prove that the sombre religion of the country did not repress, even if it failed to stimulate, affectionate sensibility. In one of the sepulchral paintings of Volterra, 'a female is stretched upon her 'couch: her father, husband, sisters or daughters, are weeping 'around her: her little ones stand at her bedside, unconscious

[1] The following extract will show how loose a rein Professor Orioli, a distinguished member of the modern school of Italian antiquaries, has given to his fancy in mystic interpretation:—'The Grotta de Pompeio at Tarquinii,' says he, 'manifestly figures the kingdom of Shades and the infernal world. The pillar in the centre is the chief of the five mountains which were supposed to support our globe. The surrounding frieze expresses this still better in the language of art; for its upper portion, with its waves and dolphins, indicates most clearly the sea which covers the infernal world and surrounds our globe; and the lower, with rose flowers, indicates the infernal world itself, which has its peculiar vegetation. The pillar itself, still better to set forth the hidden idea of the artist, bears the rose flowers, but no waves or dolphins, because the central mountain which it represents has vegetation, but is not covered by the sea. Nor are the mutules and triglyphs without meaning; for as in architecture they represent beams and rafters, so here they are hieroglyphical of the skeleton and framework of the infernal world and of its great mountain, which of rocks makes beams, but not less bold than that other, which of the waves of the sea makes a meander pattern.'—*Ann. Inst.* 1834, pp. 156-159.

'how soon they are to be bereft of a mother's tenderness—a 'moment near at hand, as is intimated by the presence of a 'winged genius with a torch on the point of expiring. Again, 'on an urn, on the lid of which he reclines in effigy, a youth is 'represented on horseback about to start on that journey from 'which no traveller returns, when his little sister rushes in, and 'strives to stay his horse's steps—in vain, for the relentless 'messenger of Death seizes the bridle and hurries him away. 'Here, again, the man is already mounted, driven away by 'Charon with his hammer; while a female genius affectionately 'throws her arm round the neck of the disconsolate widow, and 'tries to assuage her grief.'—Vol. ii. p. 193.

But, perhaps, the most honourable trait of Etruscan character, distinguished alike from Grecian and Oriental customs, is the national homage to the fair sex. The assertion of Nepos, that no Roman was ashamed to be seen with his lady by his side at table, is eminently true of Etruria, in whose sepulchral devices husband and wife are constantly seen reclining together in family and festal scenes. Indeed, it is highly probable that the Roman veneration for woman, which so prominently figures in the annals of the Eternal City—in the legend of Virginia, the chaste revenge of Lucretia, the heroism of Clœlia—exhibiting the Roman matron as the

> ——— 'Clarum ac venerabile nomen,
> 'Gentibus, ac nostræ multum quod profuit urbi'—

was at least fostered by Etruscan influence. The Athenians considered the graces of art and literature thrown away upon their consorts, and reserved all feminine accomplishments to enhance the fascinations of their mistresses: whereas the Etruscan ladies received a refined education, and were sometimes initiated into the mysteries of divination; and the same courtesy and homage which attended them on earth followed them to the grave. Their sepulchral decorations and furniture are more sumptuous and elaborate than their lords'—a distinction which they well deserved, if we may judge of the elegance and modesty of their lives from the surviving scenes in which they are portrayed, and from the emblems in their hands, which are usually a pomegranate as the symbol of fertility, and a tablet or scroll, the type of education. The tyrant sex, on the other hand, are reclining in luxurious indolence, their brows wreathed with festive chaplets—a wine-jug in one hand and a goblet in the other. We have no desire to enlist in an indiscriminate defence of Etruscan manners against the charge of indelicacy; but such an accusation comes with peculiar ill grace from Greece, and we have every reason to believe that infringements of social decency were monopolised by the male sex.

Timæus might have glanced at home at the licensed nudity of Spartan and Thessalian girls, before he charged the Etruscan banqueters with being waited upon by naked handmaids. No countenance to the calumny has been elicited from any Etruscan monument, painting or relief, yet discovered: on the contrary, all surviving relics exhibit feminine forms draped in a style which might well have caused Grecian modesty to blush; and Niebuhr agrees with modern Italian writers in a summary rejection of the libels retailed by Theopompus—that inveterate scandal-monger of antiquity!—of the shameless profligacy of Etruscan morals.

Adepts in luxury, and lovers of sumptuous life, for which the richly diversified produce of Tuscany, and their widely extended commerce, gave them ample opportunities, they were far superior to the Greeks in mere material civilization. The Etruscan cities presented a remarkable contrast to those of Hellas, in the health and cleanliness which resulted from their skill in sewerage, which has left its vestiges on many an Etruscan site, and reared an undying memorial in the Cloaca Maxima of Rome. The art of drainage, in its relation to agriculture, they practised with admirable skill. On the banks of the Po, in the neighbourhood of Hadria, they carried out those operations, whereby, in modern days, the Chiana has been converted from a barren pestilential swamp into a richly cultivated plain. The river, confined within dams, was continually raising its bed, which would have rendered it necessary to heighten the dyke, and have tasked the energies of man in an unequal struggle with the powers of nature, had not the Tuscans usefully employed the superfluous waters, by diverting them into the marshes, only to withdraw them when the fertilising deposit had once been secreted. The region alluded to would be thankful for such an operation now; and Etruscan skill would have saved Florence from the terrific inundations of the middle ages. Another method which enabled them to redeem land for the purposes of agriculture, was that of tunnelling the hills in which Tuscany abounds, and thus letting off the lakes which had formed in the craters of extinct volcanoes. These tunnels, says Niebuhr, are still at work among the mountains, though unknown to the ignorant peasantry, whose tarns they drain. This extraordinary people combined in a remarkable degree the two great elements of material prosperity, agriculture and trade; their skill in husbandry needs no other eulogy than Virgil's line—

——— Sic fortis Etruria crevit—

which extols it as the vital source of the splendour and the strength of Etruria.

In commerce they rivalled Tyrian enterprise, studding with their colonies the waters of the Tyrrhene Sea, and the shores of Spain, and competing even with Carthage for the 'far isle of the Blest.'[1] Their knowledge of physic is celebrated by Æschylus.[2] In the art of war Rome condescended to borrow from Etruria, and their astronomical science enabled them to approach more nearly than any nation of antiquity to the true division of time, when they fixed the tropical year at exactly 365 days, five hours and forty minutes. But, with all this, Tuscan civilization was the civilization of the mass; not, like the glorious culture of Greece, that which elicits and fosters the brightest sparks of personal energy and genius: it stereotyped, instead of inspiring society: it could never have been prolific of the noble literary fruits of Hellenic and Roman freedom—the impassioned eloquence of Demosthenes and Æschines, the splendid harmony of Cicero, the 'pictured page' of Livy, the deep meditations of Plato, the dignity and pathos of the Greek Tragedians; it could never have fought a Marathon, nor developed an intense national unity, nor achieved the imperial idea of widespread conquest and dominion. Doubtless, the peculiar influence of the government contributed largely to imbue the national civilization with its sombre hues and rigid lines. That government was an aristocracy; but it was a close, not an open aristocracy, resembling the oligarchy of mediæval Venice, and unlike the happily tempered constitution of old Rome and our own England, which continually derives fresh pith and vigour by keeping the avenues of honour open to plebeian merit. It possessed indeed many of the inherent virtues of aristocracy—the permanence and stability it gives to government, the check upon licentious excesses which long habituation to power maintains over the ruling class; and that prevision for the future, which is natural to the holders of an hereditary stake in the land: but it was eminently defective in the cardinal virtue of antagonism; it lacked the main-spring of political energy which the democratic element embodies. But this was not all, for the spiritual and temporal functions united in the same ruler. The Chief Pontiff was the Chief Magistrate, and the terrors of superstition supported the decrees of the Prince. 'Before the gate of that Paradise,' says Mr. Dennis, 'where 'the intellect revels unfettered amid speculations on its own 'nature, on its origin, existence, and final destiny, on its relation 'to the First Cause, to other minds, and to society in general—'stood the Sacerdotal Lucumo, brandishing in one hand the

[1] Probably Madeira, or one of the Canaries.
[2] Apud Theophr. H. P. ix. 15.

'double-edged sword of secular and ecclesiastical authority, and 'holding in the other the books of Tages, exclaiming to his awe-'struck subjects, "Believe and Obey!" Liberty of thought 'and action were as incompatible with the assumption of 'infallibility in the governing power in the days of Tarchon 'and Porsena, as in those of Gregory XVI.'—*Introd.* p. i.

It is impossible to ascertain accurately the rights and position of the lower classes in Etruria. The constitution of society was probably feudal; but the commonalty were evidently not in a degraded state of serfdom, since they composed the flower of the national army, and the military profession was always a privilege in ancient times. Considering the uncertainty of the topic, it is amusing to see with what peremptory assurance two of the ablest writers on Etruria deduce the condition of the people from the character of the public works. 'It was because 'the Etruscan State,' says Niebuhr, 'was founded upon con-'quest' (an assumption!) 'that the nobles had such a multitude 'of clients, like the Thessalian penestæ, whom they employed 'in task-work, and without whom their colossal works could 'hardly have been achieved. The works of the Etruscans, the 'very ruins of which astonish us, cannot, it is perfectly evident, 'have been executed in small states without task-masters and 'bondsmen.' (Vol. i. p. 117.) Micali, on the other hand, as confi-'dently tells us that the wonderful remains extant 'do not bear 'the impress of servile labour—as little do they of the entire sub-'jection and enslavement of the people; *they are rather the works 'of well-ordered citizens*, which to him who actually inspects 'them have nothing to surpass in manual labour the powers of 'free and by no means large communities; more particularly, 'since the materials were found on the very spot, or on the 'neighbouring mountains, which are extremely abundant in 'stone for masonry.'—*Storia di Ital.* Vol. i. p. 135.

But we are sorry to see the high authority of Niebuhr employed to endorse the common fallacy, which exaggerates the influence of political constitution upon art. A brief review of the phenomena will show that, with the exception of those fantastic exertions of despotic caprice which reared the stupendous piles of Egypt and Assyria, (and the great historian confesses that Etruscan works were uniformly dedicated to *useful* purposes,) the different forms of government, and of national religion, and also the influence of climate and scenery, are at best conditions, not causes of the prosperity of art. It is observable that the useful arts flourish indiscriminately beneath the monarchical sceptre, and the republican flag, wherever the popular taste is eminently practical. Regal and *Imperial* Rome reared some of the proudest structures the

world has seen; but many of the noblest temples, aqueducts, roads and amphitheatres, were wrought under consular auspices. Throughout her most brilliant æra, Rome enjoyed a constitution in many points similar to that of Athens; but at Rome architecture—to use a single illustration—assumed, in consonance with the national bias, the useful or constructive, at Athens the ornamental form. In modern times English and American freedom has developed with intense energy the useful and mechanical sciences. But the Fine Arts are still more independent of varieties of political constitution. They require, indeed, as one of their conditions, freedom: and that they cease to bloom beneath a spiritual despotism, is clear from the invariable degeneracy of Hieratic art. But it matters not whether that freedom be the meridian splendour of an Athens under the rule of a Pericles, or the turbulent energy of faction, which, to use Dante's expressive image, tossed mediæval Florence as convulsions toss the fevered patient: or whether the sparks of genius be fostered by the wise and beneficent sceptre of an Augustus, a Leo X., or a Louis XIV. But favourable conditions may exist in abundance without a School of Art. The fires of genius rise in fitful gleams, resembling the spontaneous and irregular energy of volcanic flames, and are usually kindled by some mighty outburst of irrepressible feeling, which thrills throughout the world, religious, political, and artistic. Thus Ariosto and Tasso, two out of the five epic poets who have appeared in 3,000 years, were the offspring of a single century; and in the wonderful age that witnessed the Reformation, 'three mighty spirits,' says Mrs. Jamieson,[1] 'were stirring 'society to its depths—the spirit of bold investigation into 'truths of all kinds, which led to the Reformation; the spirit 'of daring adventure, which led men in search of new worlds 'beyond the eastern and the western oceans; and the spirit of 'art, through which men soared even to the seventh heaven of 'invention.' But the main requisite is that civilization should be individual, not collective: that it should not tend, like our own, in the opinion of the sternest of political economists, 'to 'render the power of persons acting in masses the only substan-'tial power in society, but to maintain that originality of mind 'and individuality of character which are the only source of 'any real progress, and of most of the qualities which make the 'human race superior to any herd of animals.'[2] We have been led into these remarks by a desire to protest against that debasing philosophy, so prevalent among modern writers on the

[1] Memoirs of the Early Italian Painters, vol. ii. p. 6.
[2] Mill's Pol. Econ. vol. ii. p. 530, third edition.

early history of society, which is apt to regard man as almost the passive instrument of outward influences, and to assign very undue weight to mere physical accidents in the development of art and science, and the formation of national character: thus ignoring the providential design which has chequered the attributes of races with such prodigal variety, and has so richly diversified the faculties and the destiny of the same people in the different stages of its career.

No fresh light having been recently thrown upon the Etruscan language—the only satisfactory key to the origin of the people—we will not plunge our readers into a disquisition on that insoluble enigma, the origin of the Etruscan race. Suffice it to say that, in the absence of any decisive historical evidence, the indigenous theory has been warmly espoused by Micali; the Rhætian by K. O. Müller and Niebuhr; the Celtic by the Quixotic caprice of Sir William Betham; the Egyptian by Mrs. H. Gray, and the Lydian, apparently on far better grounds, by Mr. Dennis. It cannot, however, be out of place to offer a few remarks on the characteristics and originality of Etruscan art, though we are unable to afford space to treat this branch of the subject with the detail it deserves.

And, first, we may well congratulate criticism on the blow which the Egyptian mania has received from recent investigation. It is astonishing through how many ages not only the popular traveller, but the learned historian have been haunted by the hoary imposture of the sages of the Nile, whose pride was so deeply interested in spreading the delusion that their own shores gave birth to the noble civilization of Greece. How amusing is the style in which Herodotus, after lending a willing ear to the sacerdotal myths, and stating his conviction of the Coptic origin of Hellenic culture, unconsciously refutes his own story by displaying in elaborate detail the marked contrast of Greek and Egyptian religion, manners, and social institutions! To Mr. Sharpe,[1] we believe, belongs the credit of first suggesting the source of this misapprehension. That author shows that there had been from the earliest times an important settlement of Greek traders at Naucratis and Sais in the Delta, who had always carried on a chief part of the Mediterranean traffic.

The overthrow of this little community in the reign of Amumnai Amemneb dispersed the Hellenic merchants, and the return of the refugees to their native shores was subsequently developed into a direct colonization by the people of the Nile. But in the very age when the fabulous colonies of Danaus and

[1] History of Egypt, London, 1846.

Cecrops are presumed to have left Egypt, that country was not only intensely prejudiced against all foreigners, but especially abhorred sailors, and held maritime voyages as impious. Colonel Mure observes, that the ready adoption of the Coptic fictions by the Greeks is easily explained by the characteristic zeal of the race to establish analogies between its religious rites and those of surrounding nations, each of whom had its own polytheistic system, in which they soon discovered a new variety of their own Jupiter, Apollo, or Minerva. When the question arose as to the prototype of any divinity, the award of preference was naturally assigned to Egypt, from her superior claims to antiquity of social culture. The ministers of Isis were not slow to flatter the national vanity by interweaving with the native Greek traditions divers romantic adventures respecting Io of Argos, Perseus and Helen, thoroughly foreign to the genuine principles of Egyptian mythology. The utter futility of the attempts so perseveringly made by the Ptolemies to reconcile the conflicting creeds, conclusively betrays their essential discrepancy. But there are not only historical, but the strongest philological objections to the Egyptian legend. Colonel Mure is surely entitled to his canon, that no extensive social influence can be exercised by a civilized on a comparatively barbarous people, without a corresponding influence upon its language. Now the Greek and Egyptian languages are radically distinct in character and structure: nor are there any traces of that secondary correspondence between the two vocabularies which represents social intercourse.

Those of our readers who are aware how long the ghost of this exploded fanaticism has hovered around the regions of Etruscan research, will not deny the relevancy of the foregoing remarks. Antiquaries have never been wanting who have rashly inferred the Egyptian origin of the Etruscan race and of Etruscan art, merely from the mutual presence of certain affinities common to the infancy of all art. And this in spite of national peculiarities in Etruscan relics, such as *winged* sphinxes, alien from the Coptic style: not to mention the obvious probability that the extensive commerce of Etruria enabled her to import every variety of foreign manufacture.[1] These sages

[1] Such was probably the history of the Etruscan gems or *scarabæi*, which have been far too hastily enlisted in support of the Egyptian theory. Whether they were worn as mere ornaments, or amulets as in Egypt, they are broadly distinguished from the Egyptian, both in material, form and decoration; the subjects not being hieroglyphics, as in the land of the Nile, but, generally, groups chosen from the Greek mythology, varied by chimæras and other symbols of the Etruscan creed. They have also been discovered in Ægina, Attica and Acarnania; which must therefore fairly compete with Egypt for the honour of the invention, if we are determined to deny it to Etruria.

may, perhaps, condescend to learn common sense from Mr. Dennis's admonition, that baby faces are very similar all the world round.

Of all the elaborate creations of Etruscan art, the works in bronze have probably the best title to originality. Their metallic statues not only filled the temples and luxurious palaces of Rome, but even in the age of Pericles, the Athenian poet Pherecrates sang of the Etruscan candelabra: and Phidias gave to his celebrated statue of Minerva sandals of the Etruscan *mode*. Even Athenians might well be proud of such exquisite gems as the bronze lamp in the Museum at Cortona, the casket from Vulci, the golden wreaths in the Museo Gregoriano, and the beautiful filagree-work in gold, which it would task the best efforts of Hindoo art to rival. But the chief argument in favour of their native origin is the fact, that Greek inscriptions never appear upon the bronzes, whereas they are almost invariably found on the best and largest class of the painted vases, whose Hellenic extraction is now almost an article of faith among the leading antiquaries, though it has not found equal acceptance with popular prejudice in our own country. The ordinary classification of these vases, (which embodies truth as well as error, and ought not, therefore, to be rudely thrust aside, until we have surer ground,) distinguishes three styles; the Oriental, the Etruscan, and the Greek. The title of the first is justified by the Oriental deities and chimæras, the rudeness of the design, and the prevalence of figures of wild beasts, usually lions and boars, glaring at each other: sphinxes and griffons, blended with quaint foliage and flowers, especially the lotus. The epithet Etruscan is very inappropriate to the second class, for which Archaic Greek would be a fitter designation, since it is found in great quantities in Campania and Sicily, and the subjects and inscriptions are uniformly Hellenic. It is recognised by the black figures, always a characteristic of archaicism, on a yellow ground: by a stiff, severe and thoroughly conventional design, in which the attitudes are constrained, the muscles amusingly exaggerated, and the hands and feet preposterously long, like those of an ourang-outang. The justice of the title bestowed upon the third class will hardly be disputed: it is characterised by a black ground, and is pre-eminent in elegance of form, brilliancy of varnish, and exquisite beauty of design. The devices vary from those of the preceding class only in the fact that the myths and the scenes from social and domestic life are Athenian rather than Greek, and belong, says Gerhard, to the period between 484 B.C. and 284, when the Greek colonies were in the full bloom of prosperity. Antiquaries are much divided in opinion as to their mother country;

some maintaining them to be all imported from Greece and her colonies; others asserting their native Etruscan origin; while another school attempts to reconcile conflicting facts by 'imagining an extensive population of Greeks settled for ages 'in Etruria, or at least bodies of Hellenic artists, like the 'masonic corporations of the middle ages.' (*Introd.* p. 87.) If, amid such a host of authorities, we may presume to offer an opinion, we would suggest that they were originally of Grecian manufacture, adopted as models for Etruscan imitation, with occasional variations of style; a supposition which would explain the local peculiarities which the pottery betrays on the various sites. If Etruscan bronzes found, as we have seen, a ready market in Greece, why should not Athenian vases have been equally acceptable among the luxurious Etruscans? It is notorious that an extensive commerce in such articles prevailed in ancient times;[1] and the pottery of Athens, we know, was carried by the Phœnician traders to the western coast of Africa, and bartered for elephants' teeth and leopards' skins.[2] The speculæ, or bronze mirrors, which the Italians usually designate 'mystic,' though Gerhard has shown solid grounds for believing that they served no other mysteries than those of the toilet, have certainly far higher pretensions to Etruscan invention than the vases. For the most numerous class, although decorated with scenes taken from the cycle of Greek mythology, or heroic legend, are always illustrated by Etruscan inscriptions, and often nationalized by the introduction of Etruscan demons. And another style, though not so common, is ornamented, says Mr. Dennis, with the symbols of the divinities of the national creed, from the Nine great Gods who wielded the thunder, through all the grades of their wild and multiform demonology, to the lowly Penates, the protectors of the domestic hearth. The inscriptions on these mirrors shed so valuable a light upon the national manners and religion, that Chevalier Bunsen terms them 'a Figurative Dictionary of Etruscan Mythology,' and they will probably be the basis of all that may ultimately be known of the Etruscan tongue.

From this brief review of the main features of Etruscan civilization, the reader will, perhaps, be able to judge how exaggerated is Mr. Dennis's estimate of the influence of Etruria upon Rome. That influence, indeed, was deep and lasting; but it was so, because, in mingling with the Roman character, it mingled with an element essentially nobler than itself. To Etruria Rome owed those emblems of petty rule which her own energies converted into the symbols of an earth-encircling

[1] Pliny, lib. xxxv. cap. 46. [2] Grote, History of Greece, vol. iii. p. 364.

dominion. To Etruria she owed that stern theocratic discipline which so deeply coloured, though it did not originally inspire, her greatest national virtue—the devoted patriotism of her children. From Etruria Rome derived that idea of the omnipresence of the Divinity, and that love of ceremonial ordinance, which contributed so powerfully to rivet the traditional creed upon the popular mind. But the Roman character was built upon too wide and varied a foundation to allow of the tyranny of any single principle in its constitution. Unlike the partial and one-sided type which distinguished the Grecian communities, the qualities of three races mingled in its formation; the nobler and simpler worship of his Sabine and Latin ancestors saved the Roman from the dogmatic formalism which enchained the people of Tarquinii; from the caste-like distinction of priests and people, and the formal civilization of Etruria; and above all, from the rapid degeneracy of religion into superstition, and then of fanaticism into hypocrisy, which had sapped Etruscan morals before the era of the Roman conquest. Where shall we find the Etruscan original of those admirable maxims, which Tully quotes with honest pride in his treatise on the laws? which bade the Roman propitiate[1] the Deity, not with sumptuous offerings, but with the incense of a virtuous life; which prohibited all unholy[2] and licentious objects of adoration; which taught the indwelling[3] of the Divinity in the minds of the good; and, for ages, sacredly maintained the principle of an hereditary national religion, both against the waywardness of private dissent,[4] and the torrent of Greek and Oriental corruptions? Where are we to recognise the Etruscan rivals of that long triumphal train of senators, warriors, and patriots, the glory of the Roman name, the grandest fruit of any heathen system—of that splendid literary array, that disputes the palm with Hellas—of that immortal legacy of jurisprudence, which has been the admiration and despair of posterity?

Let us not, however, forget the beautiful lesson taught by the Etruscan tombs—the lesson of veneration for the dead! Let us mourn over the glorious wrecks so thickly strewn upon the bosom of that exquisite land, once studded with fair and blooming cities; where now the moss-grown heights she once crowned scarce bear a vestige of Tarquinii; while 'the very

---

[1] Cicero de Legg. ii. viii. Ad Divos adeunto caste: *pietatem adhibento: opes amovento.*

[2] Ib. ib. Nulla Vitiorum sacra solennia obeunto.

[3] Ib. xi. Deos ipsos in animis suis collocatos putent.

[4] Ib. viii. Separatim nemo habessit Deos: neve novos, nisi publicè adscitos, oluntо. Foreign Deities could only be admitted within the Roman Pantheon by decree of the Senate.

'site of Volsinii is forgotten; silence has long reigned in the 'crumbling theatre of Ferentum; the plough yearly furrows 'the bosom of Vulci; and the fox, the owl, and the bat, are the 'sole tenants of the vaults within the ruined walls of Cosa.' (Vol. ii. p. 193.) Let us not forget, too, how the loveliness of Nature has survived the decay of art, the fall of empire. The snow-white pinnacles and towers, the fairy scene that greeted the eye of the voyager Rutilius, as he turned his prow towards the far-famed harbour of Luna, have long been numbered with the things of yore. Not so the gifts of Nature to that glorious bay! Still the purest of waves mirrors 'pine-crested convents '—luxuriant groves — storm-defying forts — castled crags— 'proud headlands—foam-fretted islets—dark heights, prodigal 'of wine and oil—purple mountains behind—and naked marble-'peaked Apennines over all, (vol. ii. p. 80,)

"Islanded in immeasurable air."'

Still the green Maremma (unhealthy only in the summer) expands its 'sunbright waste of beauty'—its 'lawns and wasteness wild,' that inspired Dante's imagination with his picture of the Infernal Wood—matted with a dense and almost tropical luxuriance, where the boar, the buffalo, the roebuck range unscared by the foot of man. And what shall eclipse the scenery on the verge of the Faliscan plain, where 'the cliffs, 'broken into fantastic forms, and hollowed into caves of myste-'rious interest, display the richest hues of brown, red, orange 'and grey; wood hangs from their every ledge, and even crests 'their brows—a wood as varied in mass as in tint—olive, ash, 'alder, oak, chestnut—matted together with ivy, vines, clematis 'and honey-suckle; a stream winds brawling through the hol-'low, here spanned by a rustic bridge, there sinking in a mimic 'cascade; now struggling among the fallen, moss-grown crags, 'now running riot through some lonely mill, half hid by foliage.' Vol. i. p. 154.

ART. IV. —"*The Kings of the East;*" *an Exposition of the Prophecies; determining, from Scripture and from History, the Power for whom the Mystical Euphrates is being "dried up;" with an Explanation of certain other Prophecies concerning the Restoration of Israel.* London. Seeleys. 1849.

AMONG the signs of that desire to penetrate the secrets of futurity which lies so deeply enshrined in the heart of man, whether Pagan or Christian, civilized or uncultivated, it is no marvel that investigation of the fortunes of God's ancient people should occupy a very marked and prominent position; for the conversion of the Jews to Christianity has long been looked for as the Church's last great labour of love—the sure token of the immediate return of her Lord to judgment. Among living divines, who have expressed their concurrence in such belief, it may suffice to name Archdeacon Grant and Canon Wordsworth; within the last three centuries it has been proclaimed by theologians of the most opposite communions, as, for instance, Estius and Vitringa; in the Middle Ages it appears to have been held by the latest of the fathers, S. Bernard, and by the greatest of the schoolmen, Aquinas; in earlier times it may be found associated with the very noblest names of saints and doctors—Gregory, Hilary, Cyril of Alexandria, Jerome, Augustine, Chrysostom. It may be indeed that S. Jerome wavers and is not quite consistent with himself; the 'golden-mouthed' Archbishop of Constantinople (herein followed by Aquinas and Cajetan) may proceed to the extreme length of asserting that *none* among the descendants of Abraham after the flesh shall in those last days remain in unbelief; while S. Gregory more reasonably supposes that a large and signal conversion would satisfy and adequately fulfil the promises of ancient prophecy. But these are minor points, diversities such as we must expect to meet with in any enunciations of belief upon subjects of large extent, and of necessity somewhat obscure and undefined—and so far are they from weakening the effect of the general agreement, that they may fairly be considered rather to increase its weight and influence.

There has been, however, by some writers (and more especially in the present day), combined with the expectation of a great Jewish conversion in the last times, a further hope, amounting in some cases to a positive conviction, that Israel and Judah will be collected from all quarters of the globe, and enjoy

territorial possession of their long-lost homes in Palestine. The supporters of this view appeal, for proof of its correctness, to the undying hopes and sentiments of the race of Israel, the language of certain among the primitive fathers, and the words of Holy Scripture itself.

We propose to devote some pages to the consideration of this two-fold subject. If any approximation to a thorough sifting of the evidence be not merely far beyond the limits of an article, but likewise greatly exceed the bounds of our knowledge and ability, it may yet be possible, (with the aid of learned men, who have indicated the best places for research,) to extract so much material as may supply a basis for argument, and a help towards the formation of an opinion, on the part of such as feel any interest in the inquiry.

And firstly, with reference to the belief in a large and a very general conversion from the ranks of Judaism before the consummation of all things. That belief, however vague and indefinite—however much infused into the general mind of Christendom rather by a floating kind of tradition, than as the result of strict inquiry—yet certainly seems to be originally based upon the sure warrant of Holy Scripture. The great men who have from time to time enunciated their views concerning it, invariably appeal to the words of Prophets and Apostles; and although we must beware of the error of erecting interpretations of prophecy into articles of faith, yet that must be a strange and unenviable frame of mind which can treat such a *consensus* lightly. A few of the most obvious and prominent passages of Scripture shall presently be set down, and the comments of the leading Fathers will be quoted in the course of our investigation. But it may be well to commence with a brief notice of the objections which have been urged against these interpretations of prophecy.

Some of these objections, which have been sought from Holy Scripture, savour less of conviction on the part of the objectors, than of that scholastic ingenuity which loved to create a difficulty for the sake of solving it. (1) Few unbiassed readers of the 69th Psalm would be inclined so to press the force of the word 'ever' in the 24th verse, ('and ever bow thou down their backs,' '*et dorsum eorum semper incurva*,' Vulg.) as to argue that it shut out the objects of the divine malediction from *all* hope of the erect countenance and clear vision of faith. (2) In like manner the marked distinction between Israel and Judah, in Hosea i. 6, 7, (fulfilled in the return of the *two* tribes and dispersion of the *ten*), can hardly be thought seriously to militate against the possibility of Jews from every tribe returning to their King before He comes to judgment. (3) The same may

be said concerning the words of the Prophet Amos (ii. 4—16): as a threat of chastisment they are clear, and have been, and are still being, most signally and terribly fulfilled; but to make them into an edict of perpetual exclusion from God's Church, appears sadly strained and unnatural. (4) And as regards the very strong expressions employed by S. Paul concerning his countrymen in his first Epistle to the Thessalonians (ii. 15, 16), it may be observed, that even the rendering of the Vulgate, to the effect that 'wrath is come upon them even to the end,' *usque in finem*, is by no means incompatible with the supposition that their repentance should be almost coincident with the termination of the world's great drama; although most scholars and critics would, we think, consider the English version of the Apostle's εἰς τέλος ('to the uttermost') to be a far more adequate expression of his meaning. (5) There are, however, two sentences pronounced by our Lord himself, which have been thought adverse to any spiritual hopes of Judaism. One of these is a remarkable saying recorded by S. John (v. 43);[1] the other, the curse upon the barren fig-tree, which has always been recognised as a type and figure of the Synagogue. Now there is no doubt but that the ancient interpretation of our Lord's announcement, that one coming in his own name would be received, applied the words to the Antichrist who should appear in the last days. In this interpretation (which, by the way, seems accepted by Lord Bacon) we may concur, and further may likewise admit that it appears to hint that this 'last foe of the fold' will be welcomed and believed in by the Jews. Yet this acceptance need not prove so large as to involve the entire race of Israel, nor again so complete as to leave no opportunity for change of sentiment; while the type of the fig-tree, however fully admitted, must yet be subjected to the limitations imposed upon all types, and not be forced into an utter exactitude of resemblance. The literal fig-tree was indeed dried up from the roots, and withered away, but it does not thence follow that the figurative one shall know no second life.

And if we are disposed to weigh the authority of great human testimonies, the scantiness of the list of those who adopted what we may term the *negative* side, is most remarkable. Among ancient authors, there is probably one alone who has opposed the general concurrence of opinion—Cæsarius, the brother of S. Gregory Nazianzen. But his name, though a holy and respected one, cannot be reckoned in the first rank of the Church's doctors, and is not of sufficient weight to claim great

[1] 'I am come in My Father's name, and ye receive Me not: if another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive.'

attention when it stands alone. It is more curious to light upon intimations that, in the sixteenth century, the theology of Switzerland inclined to the same view which had been put forward by Cæsarius. But this state of opinion did not last. Benedictus Aretius, a very eminent ecclesiastic of Berne, who died in A.D. 1574, gave in his adhesion to the general interpretation of the eleventh chapter of the Epistle to the Romans—a circumstance noted by Estius in his commentary, with evident pleasure and satisfaction.[1] Had the life of Estius been prolonged, he might have found that Protestants were *more* than willing to agree with him in this respect. Vitringa even treats with some roughness those who ventured to dissent from a belief so apparently well founded. Of two distinguished men whom he thus condemns, viz. Hammond and Lightfoot, it may be observed that the former is not consistent with himself, for he follows the usual mode of understanding Romans xi.; while the latter reasons from abstract considerations, of no great force in themselves, and in a question of this nature absolutely valueless. For surely to say, as Lightfoot does, that the Jews of our Lord's time 'sinned against such light as shall *never* appear to their eyes again,'[2] is a pure assumption—an assumption, moreover, which, even if proved, would not meet the requirements of the case. Who, but One above, can judge whether any nation or any human being may deserve a fresh probation, or the contrary? If such were the common line of argument on that side, we can hardly wonder at Vitringa's language: 'Atqui 'dari et esse tantum bonum in promissis Ecclesiæ, quis inficias 'eat post clarissimam Apostoli doctrinam? Certè quicunque 'tentaverint hactenus, inter quos Lightfootus et Hammondus, '*infeliciter sunt exsecuti.*'[3]

We proceed to state the arguments (in our judgment much more forcible) in favour of eventual conversion. It may be that some particular passages of Holy Scripture which have been alleged upon this side will appear, to an impartial critic, as unavailing as those which have been already alluded to upon the negative view of the question. In patristic and medieval

[1] This circumstance is so little suspected, that it seems worth while to quote the passage. 'Quod adeo clarum apparet ex serie sermonis apostoli, ut *etiam* sectariorum quidam non infimi nominis theologus, Benedictus Aretius, evidentiâ hujus loci convictus, apertissimè fateatur ac doceat in suo commentario generalem futuram Judæorum in fine mundi conversionem, ita ut major pars eorum tunc viventium agnitura sit Christum suum. Quam rem etiam subjunctâ ad Deum oratione prosequitur.'—Estius in D. Pauli Epist. (tom. i. p. 173.) Ed. Duaci, A. D. 1614. Our own quaint divine, Thomas Fuller, concludes his 'Pisgah-view of Palestine,' with a like prayer.

[2] Sermon at St. Mary's, Cambridge, Works, vol. ii. p. 1123, Ed. London, A. D. 1684. In another place (vol. i. p. 375), he speaks more guardedly upon the subject.

[3] Vitringa in Jesaiam, cap. xi. v 11, (tom. i. p. 442, Ed. Herbornæ, A. D. 1715.)

writings we find the Jewish nation regarded as the great collective Cain, who had shed 'the blood of sprinkling that speaketh better things than that of Abel.' And even as the blood of Abel cried unto God from the ground, and he became 'a fugitive and a vagabond in the earth;' and as 'the Lord set a mark upon Cain, lest any finding him should kill him;' so these, too, who had slain their brother, the true Abel, were to wander forlorn over the globe—marked, set aside, rejected 'from the presence of the Lord.' The language of the fifty-ninth Psalm was, as we shall see, continually applied to them.[1] But not in its threats alone: the words which, in our Bible version, say that 'they return at evening' (in the Vulgate, *convertentur ad vesperam*) were ever borne in mind, and referred to as a ground of hope for that unhappy race before the coming of the final night. Now those who care little for types and analogies may pass by the similitude of Cain, and may argue, not without some show of reason, that the quotation from the Psalmist is violently severed from its context. But there is all imaginable difference between the use of figures and allusions to complete, to enforce, and to illustrate, and the employment of the same things as self-sufficing proofs and a primary basis of argument. And here the appeal lay first to those inspired declarations which look clear and evident. To cite two only out of a crowd of such testimonies: 'Afterward shall the children of Israel return 'and seek the Lord their God and David their king; and shall 'fear the Lord and his goodness in the latter days.' 'I would 'not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery, lest 'ye should be wise in your own conceits; that blindness in part 'is happened to Israel until the fulness of the Gentiles be come 'in. And so all Israel shall be saved.'[2] The opinions of commentators upon these and kindred promises we defer for the moment, and leave the sacred words to speak for themselves.

There are many to whom it would seem accordant with the analogy of the divine announcements respecting the future, that the spoken prophecy should be accompanied with an *acted* prophecy or type. If Cain, the first murderer; Canaan, accursed of his father; Hagar, cast out for her mocking; Miriam, shut out from the camp; be all as images of the unbelieving people,[3] is there none among the saints of the elder covenant

[1] S. Aug. Enarr. in Psalm. lviii. (our lix.) Ibid. in Psalm. xl. (xli.) S. Bernard, Epist. 363. See, too, Mr. Trench's note on these words of a hymn by Adam of S. Victor (Sacred Latin Poetry, p. 146):—

'Quia regem peremerunt,
Rei regnum perdiderunt:
Sed non deletur penitus
Caïn, in signum positus.'

[2] Hosea iii. 5. Romans xi. 25. [3] Vitringa on Isaiah l. 1, 2, (tom. ii. p. 704.)

upon whom we may cast our eyes as the pledge of better things to come? Yes, there is one such figure—a type, as it seems to us, of peculiar beauty and significance. There is a patriarch in whose career great writers of all ages—a Chrysostom, a Pearson, a Pascal—have delighted to trace the history of their Lord. Sold to the Midianites, slandered and condemned, though innocent; in prison between two offenders, of whom one is pardoned and one condemned; freed in the *third* year after *two* years of captivity; exalted to the right hand of Pharaoh, his wrongs the means of preserving life to others; in these and in other details men have long been brought to see the portraiture of the betrayed, the crucified, the risen and ascended Lord. It has not been, perhaps, so frequently observed, that it was *through the homage paid to Joseph by the heathen that his guilty brethren were brought to bow before him, and that he again made himself known to them.*[1] And shall not the ever-widening circle of pagan acknowledgment of Him whom his brethren after the flesh betrayed, bring *them* likewise in the fulness of time to kneel to him with prayer and praise; and the order of Simeon's prophetic words be literally preserved, 'the Lord's Christ' being first a 'light to lighten the Gentiles,' and then, in a fuller sense than ever, 'the glory of his people Israel?' The confident feeling of the fathers will be shown by the passages to be hereafter cited in connexion with the second branch of our inquiry. It is true, that no strength of conviction on this head would justify men in counting upon this event as a sure warning of the judgment-day; for (as a great theologian, Dean Jackson[2] reminds us) it might please the Almighty that such conversion should be sudden, and leave no interval for preparation on the part of those who witnessed it. But taking into account the *primâ facie* meaning of holy writ—the sanction given to such understanding of its meaning by the wise and good in all ages of the Church of Christ, the absence of weighty counter arguments or any names of high authority—it is no exaggeration to assert that there is not a point of belief concerning the future, without the boundaries of the Creeds, which has stronger claims upon the acceptance of a Christian man.

We now turn to the second portion of our subject—the *temporal* prospects of the Jewish race. There exists, as has been said, a school of interpretation which teaches that the Jews shall again become a nation, and enjoy the blessings of

[1] It is mentioned by Jones of Nayland, in his well-known little *Book of Nature;* and in the notes to a recent translation of Genesis by the Rev. J. Jervis. We do not know who first called attention to the point.

[2] Comment. on the Creed, (vol. i. p. 153, Ed. Lond. A. D. 1673.)

freedom and prosperity in the Holy Land. Whether their conversion to Christianity shall be contemporaneous with this event, or prior, or subsequent to it, is a point on which there may, naturally enough, be differences of opinion; but the prevalent view among the interpreters referred to we believe to be, that the restoration to Palestine will precede, and the conversion follow very speedily.

Now if these events, in their leading features at least, be written in the Word of God, it is enough, once and for all *cadit quæstio.* No abstract considerations, no apparent difficulties in the sight of man, can be accounted of the slightest weight in this; as in all things we ought to be 'fully persuaded that what He has promised He is able also to perform.' But if there be any room for doubt as regards the right understanding of His promises—and certainly religious and learned men *have* greatly doubted the correctness of this interpretation of them—it may then be perfectly lawful to enter upon any reverent course of reflection which may tend to throw light upon the probable meaning of these prophecies.

(*a.*) That there is no *necessary* connexion in the nature of things between the acceptance of Christianity and a particular habitation upon earth, will, of course, be universally admitted. We are not, as the Syrians of old, believers in gods of the hills and gods of the valleys: we do not seek, with the woman of Samaria, a mount Gerizim whereon to worship. The religion of the true Prophet knows no Mecca; His Gospel, though 'beginning at Jerusalem,' never summons the believers to the *local* Zion. On the contrary, it is the very glory of that society, which is built upon Him as its corner-stone, that it utterly repudiates such distinctions, that it is *essentially* universal, Catholic; that it strives to become 'all things to all men;' that 'there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free; but Christ is all and in all.' But however fully these truths may be granted, we would fain ask whether they are thoroughly borne in remembrance and always duly weighed in their bearings upon the case before us? Do they harmonise best with a *literal* or with a *spiritual* fulfilment of the hopes held out to Judaism?

(*b.*) In close connexion with these ideas stands the received interpretation of the vision vouchsafed to Nebuchadnezzar. If the holy Daniel interpreted it, as most men think, to mean the four great empires of ancient heathendom, Assyria and Persia, Greece and Rome, and if the image representing them vanished away before 'the stone cut out without hands,' may not this be hint, not, indeed, that the Almighty does not as ever rule in he kingdom of men, and give it to whomsoever He will; but

that we as Christians are to be less concerned with the fate and fall of kingdoms, since that great one has been set up which shall never be destroyed, but stand for ever? May not sympathy for that outcast race be in danger of recalling our thoughts from the spiritual to the earthly, from the manna to the fleshpots, if we insist on associating the idea of territorial possessions and national eminence to their hoped-for reception of those better blessings which are not for time, but for eternity?

(*c.*) Again, it is well known that this view of the promises is the one adopted by the Jews. '*Hanc opinionem origine Judaicam esse inter omnes constat,*' says a learned German of a kindred theory.[1] Can this circumstance be esteemed a recommendation? That people, so singularly infelicitous in divining the real meaning of the voices of their prophets, that they fulfilled them and perceived not what they did; that people, to whom the birth in Bethlehem and the slaughter of the innocents, the miracles, and the triumphal entry, the death with the malefactors, and the burial by Joseph, brought no thought of what had been foretold by Isaiah, and Jeremiah, and Zachariah; that people, who have oftentimes accepted as the Christ the most wretched impostors, like Barchochebas, while 'when Moses is read the vail is upon their heart;' is it to *them* that we are to look for suggestions respecting the true sense of the seers of old? They pray indeed in all their services that they may regain the land of their forefathers, and such a prayer may well accord with the spirit of the elder covenant. For the righteous to be 'blessed in the city and blessed in the field,' was then a part of the dispensation of the Almighty; to die without passing the Jordan was a grievous chastisement to their great Lawgiver. But are these blessings of like value in that newer kingdom, wherein the Cross precedes the Crown, alike for the Head and for the Members? Is the possession of the earthly Canaan, to a *Christian* eye, so very vast a prize, so worthy a fulfilment of the royal promises of Him who is the King of kings? Glorious, and full of poetry in its highest sense, as was the position of Moses on Mount Pisgah, yet must not its splendours grow dim and fade away before the marvels in which he shared on Mount Tabor? It was natural for him, while on earth, to mourn the loss of Canaan; could he, if it may be said with reverence, now desire it for the people whom he led?

(*d.*) Although we are taught that Israel is the *first-born* son of God,[2] yet it follows from this 'that other nations are also 'sons, and so the objects of His fatherly care; and therefore the

[1] Otto, note to S. Justin Martyr, Dial. cum Tryph. § 80, (tom. ii. p. 276.)
[2] Exodus iv. 22.

'disobedience of the first-born nation may lead to the installing 'others in its dignity. The pre-eminence of that tribe to which 'they belonged, only originated with the times immediately sub-'sequent to the flood—a dispensation, therefore, which puts 'them upon a level with other nations, may not be any new 'thing under the sun, but that which hath been already.'[1] The sin of Reuben was, we may trust, forgiven; but neither he nor his descendants ever regained the patriarchal privileges of the eldest-born; but the three gifts were made separate and passed away—the royalty to Judah, the priesthood to Levi, the double portion to the sons of Joseph.[2]

(*e.*) There are certain prophecies of the most distinct and *apparently* literal character, to which, notwithstanding, it has not pleased their Author to vouchsafe a literal fulfilment. Such is, for example, the promise made to David that his throne should be established for ever;[3] for, again, the pledge given to the tribe of Levi that their priesthood should be everlasting.[4] As a plain matter of fact, no descendant of David now possesses temporal rule, no son of Levi ministers at God's altar.[5] There is therefore no violence done to the sacred text, nor any want of due reverence, in supposing that some other prophecies may not await any fulfilment according to the letter. And if it be urged that the particular examples given above are limited by attendant circumstances, or the force of other equally important texts, we answer that a like limitation may be reasonably shown to exist with respect to some of those passages which are said to prove the future restoration of the Jews to Canaan.

(*f.*) The 'theory of the double sense,' as it has been called, is all but universally recognised among students of Holy Scripture. It has been put forth with much force and clearness by the late Dr. Arnold, in two valuable and very uncontroversial sermons. Without, however, going the whole length of his system (for he inclines somewhat *too* exclusively to the spiritual meaning), we would ask whether it is not a general canon of interpretation, that where a prophecy has already

---

[1] Morris's Essay towards the conversion of the Hindus, p. 134. He quotes S. Cyril, cont. Julian. εἴπερ ἐστι Θεοῦ πρωτότοκος ὁ Ἰσραὴλ, ἔχει πάντως που καὶ ἀδελφοὺς ἑτέρους, ὡς ὑπὸ πατέρα τὸν Θεόν.

[2] See 1 Chron. v. 1, 2; and Gen. xlviii. 21, 22.

[3] 2 Samuel vii. 12—16. 1 Chron. xvii. 11—15. Ps. lxxix.

[4] Exod. xl. 15. Numb. xxv. 13.

[5] Of the one pretended exception to the truth of this latter statement, a friend, on whom we can rely, writes as follows: 'The Jews in Poland *think* that they have hereditary priesthood, and that the descent has been faithfully preserved. This is not an universal opinion; and, of course, can be nothing more than an opinion: for in the destruction of Jerusalem the genealogies were destroyed.'

received *one* fulfilment, and that a *literal* one, we may most safely expect its *second* accomplishment to be *spiritual?*[1] For instance, commentators of great mark have seen in the triumphs of him 'that cometh from Edom, with dyed garments from Bozrah,' a primary allusion to the victories of Judas Maccabæus. But the English (and indeed the entire Western) Church, on the Monday before Easter, most plainly sanctions that spiritual sense of the chapter which the early Fathers with one voice proclaim. If this principle have any truth, let it be applied to the predictions of those prophets who lived either before or during the captivity in Babylon. Their promises of a return *have been once fulfilled* in the letter; are they not now awaiting a far nobler fulfilment in the spirit?

(*g.*) Last among these our would-be 'aids to reflection,' shall be named a consideration, which, in importance, must rank perhaps as the very first. In attempting to fix a meaning upon the frequently obscure sayings of prophecy, it is surely only natural to gain a clue, if it be possible, from the light which is shed forth in the New Testament. The Apocalypse, it is true, may be fully as dark as the visions of Ezekiel, both being books of prophecy; but this cannot be said of the Gospels and Epistles. Any plain texts in these last, or in the Acts, should surely be allowed great weight in the formation of our decision. Yet, obvious as this rule may seem, there is none perhaps more entirely lost sight of by our present popular school of prophetic interpretation. One might think that its disciples had never heard of the Epistles to the Hebrews and the Galatians, so utterly do they ignore them in their inquiries. But would it be an unfit preparation for research into the true signification of ancient prophecies, for the student to remind himself that it is to *Christians* (and not in any way to Jews, *as such*,) that are addressed those striking words; 'Ye are come unto Mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem.' Even the Apocalypse is plain in its usage of these hallowed names; 'the city of my God, new Jerusalem,' 'the holy city, new Jerusalem;' 'and lo! a lamb stood on the Mount Sion.'[2] Then, as if to warn us against confounding the temporal with the eternal city, S. Paul has made a special contrast between the 'Jerusalem which now is,' and the 'Jerusalem which is above, the mother of us all.'[3] Moreover, he assures

---

[1] Would not this seem natural even according to the course of *human* thought?

'Put out the light, and then—put out the light:'—

The first sense is literal, but it is the *figurative* light that Othello refers to in the *second* place.

[2] Heb. xii. 22. Rev. iii. 12; xxi. 2. [3] Gal. iv. 25.

us in the same Epistle that 'they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham;' and again, 'If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise.' There are many passages, which a painstaking reader—if we be fortunate enough to find such—would do well to compare with the above. Such are, for example, Acts iii. 24, Romans ix. 24—33, and 1 S. Peter i. 10—12. But we must here content ourselves with a single illustration of the bearing of this class of texts. We open the Bible at the thirty-first chapter of the book of the Prophet Jeremiah. It is full of local allusions; Samaria and Mount Ephraim, Ramah and the land of Judah, stand conspicuously prominent, and it closes with mention of the tower of Hananeel, the hill Gareb, and the brook Kidron. Any promise, then, herein made 'to the house of Israel and the house of Judah' is a promise (it may be argued) to the *literal* Jews and Israelites; otherwise it would not be placed in the very heart and centre, as it were, of such numerous references to definite spots in Palestine. And such argument would appear sound, and probably be irrefragable, were the *Old* Testament the sole heritage of Christians. But what a flood of light is poured upon the entire chapter, and through it upon the language of prophecy at large, when we discover, from the inspired commentary of the Epistle to the Hebrews[1] that the 'new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah' means *the Christian covenant;* that the great twofold gift of justification and sanctification, so distinctly promised through Jeremiah, could never have been intended to be granted to the sons of Israel by mere earthly descent, but to the true Israelites, who have been made such in Christ Jesus, 'that the righteousness of the law,' says the Apostle, 'might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit.' Surely, just as the condescension of our Lord, in explaining the first and the second of his parables, has given us a key to all the rest, even so, too, a few words of his Apostles may open many doors of interpretation, which must otherwise have been completely shut. Let it once be thoroughly impressed upon the student's mind that the word 'Israel' is so spiritualised under the Gospel that S. Paul actually adds the phrase 'after the flesh,' when he would designate his kinsmen as distinguished from the 'Israel of God,' and will not his views of the predictions of Jeremiah and Ezekiel and their fellow-prophets assume a very different aspect? '*A careful examination of the context,*' says a learned Orientalist already cited, 'will, I think, generally 'show that such passages as are most strong *at first sight* for the

[1] Chap. viii. 8—13.

'return of the Jews in a literal outward sense, are to be under-'stood of the Jews in a spiritual sense, the Jews which are Jews 'inwardly, and children of the faith of Abraham. This, I think, 'would be the result of such examination, if made by a person igno-'rant of the opinions of the Fathers and others upon the subject."[1] With this expression of opinion we perfectly agree, and would only add that the force of the context is then peculiarly strong, when it involves some condition (as, for example, the restoration of the rule of David) which no one has ever taken literally. And here it is time to conclude these general considerations. We may subsequently, perhaps, apply them to the examination of a few passages of the prophetic writings—a few only, for the decision arrived at upon one or two will be generally found to fix the judgment on the rest.

But to those who have any diffidence in their own judgment it would be a real joy and comfort to ascertain, if possible, the sentiments of the general mind of Christendom. The performance of this task is, we must repeat, very far beyond our powers; but much assistance may be derived, as has been intimated, from the labours of some learned writers, whose names shall be set down below.[2] To all of them we shall lie under the greatest obligations, though we have not ventured on the dangerous plan of accepting either their results or their quotations upon trust.

Such materials as we have collected appear to fall naturally under the four following heads.

I. The sentiments of the leading Fathers, who have been

---

[1] Morris on Conversion of Hindus, p. 252.

[2] Our chief aids as indicators (and, in some cases, quoters) of passages, bearing upon this subject, have been as follows. 1. Estius, Comment. in D. Paul. Epist. (see especially on Rom. xi.): and again, more fully, the same writer in lib. iv. Sentent. Distinct. 47, § 11, 12, (tom. iv. p. 541, ed. Paris, A. D. 1701.) He treats his thesis with his usual depth and dignity; though, in the last-named work, rather too scholastically. 2. Spencer ad Origenem cont. Celsum, lib. iv., a copious and valuable note. The Benedictine editors have given it in their edition (tom. i. p. 516). 3. Suicer, in his Thesaurus (sub voce Ἰουδαῖος) furnishes some useful additional matter, but is not very copious nor discriminating. 4. Morris, besides the very valuable hints given above, is most useful in indicating the indicators. His appeal to Josephus seems questionable. 5. Dr. Pusey indirectly touches upon the question in a note (on the Millennium) to the Oxford Translation of Tertullian, (vol. i. p. 120 *seq.*) Of this note it is enough to say that in richness, completeness, and mastery over its materials, it is entirely worthy of its author. 6. In favour of the temporal restoration may be named, Nath. Homes, D.D., 'The Resurrection Revealed,' A. D. 1654, (re-published in London, A. D. 1833.) a book of some curiosity and learning; 'Tracts for the Jews,' by the Rev. A. S. Thelwall, M.A. Lond. 1847; the best statement of the arguments on that side that we have seen. Many works of the kind (*e.g.* Mr. Whittaker Churton's 'Land of the Morning,') appear rather to *assume* than *prove* the point. 7. The more obvious sources of information, as the works of Eusebius, Socrates, S. Bernard, Pascal, Lowth, Vitringa, Cornelius à Lapide, Milman, Gibbon, Rev. G. Williams, and others, will be referred to in their proper places.

supposed to countenance the idea of the restoration of the Jews to Palestine.

II. The expressions of other great doctors, who may not seem to have ruled the question upon either side.

III. The tone of feeling exhibited in some acts of Jews or Christians at particular epochs in history.

IV. The opinions of distinguished authors, patristic, or of later ages, in favour of the views here advocated; viz., a spiritual interpretation of the prophecies concerning Israel, a belief in the ultimate conversion of the Jews, but *not* in their national re-existence.

I. The Fathers whose authority has been claimed in support of the view taken by the Jews themselves, are, we need scarcely say, those among the Ante-Nicene writers who have expressed their belief in the Millennium. The great names are those of S. Justin Martyr, S. Irenæus, and Tertullian. Indeed we are not aware that the other supporters of a Millenarian view have said anything that bears very closely upon our present subject; but, in any case, the views and arguments of minor teachers, (as *e.g.* the Egyptian Bishop, Nepos, mentioned by Eusebius,[1]) would probably stand or fall with these.

Now we must not suffer ourselves to be betrayed into the discussion of the *vexata quæstio* of the Millennium. Thus much, however, we may say, in passing, that the remarks of Dr. Charles Maitland, in his valuable 'Apostles' School of Prophetic Interpretation,' have not sufficed to balance, in our judgment, the weight of the counter-arguments derivable from the writings of S. Jerome and S. Augustine,[2] of our own Hammond, in his commentary on Revelation xx., and of Dr. Chr. Wordsworth in his Lectures on the Apocalypse. The reasoning of the last-named divine appears to us, in this respect, peculiarly forcible; and we may say this without danger of appearing to sympathise with the main portion of his work, as the *Christian Remembrancer* has already expressed its opinion thereon.[3] But let this pass. We maintain, that even the Chiliast doctrine, which found favour with these above-named Fathers, is something totally distinct from the modern teaching concerning the hoped-for restoration of the Jews; that their works support no such view, but, on the contrary, rather make against it; and that *the appeal to their authority* on the part of our opponents *is consequently mistaken and irrelevant.*

And, in the first place, let us look at those passages which

---

[1] Hist. Ecclesiast. vii. 24.

[2] S. Hieron in Ezechiel xx., *et alibi.* S. Aug. de Civ. Dei. lib. xx.

[3] In the number for October, A. D. 1853, vol. xxvi. p. 383.

seem most strongly to espouse the Judaic interpretation. In the well-known dialogue of S. Justin Martyr with Trypho, we read as follows (our translation is designedly literal):

'But tell me, do ye truly confess that this place, Jerusalem, shall be rebuilt; and do ye expect that your people shall be gathered together and be in joy with Christ, with the Patriarchs, and the Prophets, and those either of our race, or who became proselytes before your Christ came, or hast thou had recourse to the admission of these points, that thou mayest seem to overcome us in disputations?'

'And I answered, I am not so wretched, O Trypho, as to speak differently from what I think. I have, therefore, already admitted to thee, that I and many others think thus, as ye also fully know will come to pass; and I have intimated that many, on the other hand, of the Christians, who hold pure and religious opinions, do not admit this. . . . . But I, and the Christians, who are in all respects orthodox, know that there will be a resurrection of the flesh, and a thousand years in Jerusalem, built and adorned and enlarged, as the prophets Ezekiel and Isaiah and the rest confess.'[1]

Now it is clear that no hint is given in this passage that S. Justin, and those who agreed with him upon the subject of the Millennium, expected that this restored Jerusalem would be in any way devoted to the possession of such Christians only as had been of Jewish birth, far less to any Jews who remained in an unconverted state. If Jews were to be there, it was only those who had died before the coming of our Lord, or who, since that first advent, had accepted the faith of the Cross. Between this idea and the one popularly received and preached on behalf of the Operative Jewish Converts' Institution, there is not merely a distinction, but an irreconcileable opposition. The modern teachers look for a Jerusalem occupied by terrestrial Jews, who shall enjoy again a distinct national and political existence; S. Justin expected a Jerusalem inhabited by the faithful of all times and nations, in which the re-risen Patriarchs and the converted Israelites would find indeed their proper place, but nothing more.

There is, however, a previous passage in the same dialogue which ought, likewise, in fairness, to be quoted.

'And those two goats on the fast day bidden to be alike, of which one was sent away and the other made an offering, were an announcement of the two advents of Christ: of the one in which the elders and priests of your people led him forth as one sent away, laying their hands upon him and putting him to death; and again of his second advent, *when in this same place of Jerusalem, ye shall acknowledge him who was dishonoured by you*, and became an offering for all sinners, who desire to repent and to keep that fast which Isaiah describes, "loosing the bonds of wicked covenants," and observing the other things alike enumerated by him, and which I also have recounted, which they who believe in Jesus perform.'[2]

---

[1] Dial. cum Tryph. cap. 80, (tom. ii. pp. 272—6. Ed. Otto.)
[2] Ibid. cap. 40.

Yet here, again, we perceive nothing that would encourage hopes of national re-existence; though the far more blessed prospect of national repentance seems held out, not perhaps without some thought in the writer's mind of such passages as Zech. xii. 10, and S. Matt. xxiii. 37—39. But as nothing more to the point can be produced, the claim to the authority of S. Justin must be pronounced to be void and futile.

We turn to the pages of S. Irenæus. In his great work *Adversus Hæreses* (lib. v. cap. 35), *he* likewise adopts the *literal* interpretation of the thousand years predicted by S. John in Rev. xx. 4, and argues against that figurative sense which Origen, Jerome, Dionysius of Alexandria, and Augustine, have since made (we think most justly) the more generally received and triumphant one.

'But the whole of this cannot be understood of what is super-celestial... but in the days of the kingdom, when the earth is restored by Christ, and Jerusalem rebuilt according to the pattern which is above: Jerusalem of which saith the Prophet Isaiah, "Behold I have graven thee upon the palms of my hands: thy walls are continually before me." '[1]

But a moment's glance at the context must effectually dispel the notion that this primitive writer was thinking, when he thus wrote, of a restoration of the Jewish nationality. The inhabitants of the re-built Jerusalem are to be, in his opinion, 'as many *of the believers* as God hath provided for this'—(*quotquot ex credentibus ad hoc præparavit Deus*) and it is to take place under the reign of the saints. There is not a single word which is calculated to foster the belief that Jews would have any special advantage through their lineal descent from Abraham.

Tertullian is likewise classed among the Millenarium divines. In his treatise against Marcion, he represents his opponent as charging our Lord with promising to the Jews their former condition as about to ensue from the restitution of their country.[2] The reply of Tertullian will be more properly supplied in one of our after sections. Enough for the present to observe, that the joys of *his* Jerusalem are represented as purely spiritual, and intended for Christians in compensation for those pleasures which in the world they have either despised or lost.[3]

But though dismissing Tertullian for the present, we cannot afford thus to part with Justin or with Irenæus. For if it could

[1] 'Hæc autem talia universa non in supercœlestibus possunt intelligi—sed in Regni temporibus, revocatâ terrâ à Christo et reædificatâ Hierusalem secundum characterem quæ sursum est Hierusalem, de quâ ait Propheta Isaias,' &c. (Isa. c. 16.) For convenience we give S. Irenæus' texts from our version, there being ·bstantial variation.

Cæterum vester Christus pristinum statum Judæis pollicetur ex restitutione ,' &c.—Tertull. adv. Marcionem, lib. iii. cap. 24, (p. 412, ed. Wirceburgi, 1780.)

[3] Ibid.

be shown that these ancient writers had, like some modern divines, ignored S. Paul's use of the term 'Israel'—if they had seen but a scanty fulfilment of ancient prophecy in the blessings and privileges of Christ's Church—then might it at least be plausibly argued, that although not in letter and detail supporters of the belief in Jewish national restoration, they were *virtually* such, as sympathising with the kind of interpretation which ultimately induces such belief. But it does happen, that perhaps few writers have more clearly exhibited their strong sense of that spiritual descent from Abraham to which all true Christians may lay claim; and S. Irenæus is likewise very copious in appropriation of prophecy to the Church. These facts appear to us of such importance, as regards the present argument, that we shall, we trust, be pardoned for asking the attention of the reader to some extracts of considerable length. The blending of the *earthly* with the *spiritual* Jerusalem—the holy confidence in our present reception of God's promised gifts —will be found to deserve especial notice.

Here follow the words of S. Justin in the dialogue already referred to:—

'For the true, spiritual, Israelitish race, of Judah and Jacob and Isaac and of Abraham (who in circumcision received testimony and blessing from God upon his faith, and was called "father of many nations"), *are we, who have been led to God through this crucified Christ.*'[1]

'Come with me, all that fear God, who wish to see the good things of Jerusalem. Come let us walk in the light of the Lord, for he hath freed his people, the house of Jacob. Come, all ye Gentiles, let us be gathered together *into Jerusalem, no longer besieged for the iniquities of her people.* . . . . They, too, will desire to inherit with you, be it but a little space, who justify themselves and say that they are the sons of Abraham. And Trypho, "What is it that thou sayest, that none of us shall inherit anything in the holy Mountain of God?" And I; "I say not this, but they who have persecuted and still persecute Christ, and repent not, they shall inherit nothing in the holy mountain; but the Gentiles that have believed on Him and repented of the sins they have committed, these shall inherit with the patriarchs and the prophets and the just who have sprung from Jacob, even though they do not keep Sabbaths, nor are circumcised, nor keep the feasts, yet shall they assuredly inherit the holy inheritance of God."'[2]

One more passage only, but one of much argumentative force, shall be given from the same source as the preceding:—

'Now we are not only a people, but likewise a holy people, as we have already shown. "And they shall call them the holy people, the redeemed of the Lord." (Isa. lxii. 12.) Wherefore we are no despicable nation nor barbarous tribe, nor such as the Carian and Phrygian races, but us also hath God chosen, and hath become manifest to them that sought Him not. "Behold," saith He, "I am God to the nation who have not called

[1] Dial. cum Tryph. cap. 11.
[2] Ibid. cap. 24—26, (tom. pp. 81—87. Ed. Otto.)

upon my name." (Isa. lxv. 1. nearly thus in the LXX.) *For this is that nation which God promised of old to Abraham,* announcing that He would make him "a father of many nations," (Gen. xvii. 5,) not referring to the Arabians, nor Egyptians, nor Idumeans: since even Ishmael became the father of a great nation, and likewise Esau, and there exists a vast multitude of Ammonites. Moreover, Noah was the father of Abraham himself, and in fact of the entire human race, and other men progenitors of others. What higher favour then doth Christ here grant to Abraham? That by a like calling He summoned him with His voice, bidding him go forth out of the land wherein he dwelt. *And all of us hath he called by that voice, and we have now come forth from that conversation* (ἀπὸ τῆς πολιτείας) *in which we lived, and lived sinfully, after the common practice of the other inhabitants of the land: and we shall with Abraham inherit the holy land, having to receive our inheritance for eternity, forasmuch as through the like faith we are the children of Abraham.* For just as he believed the voice of God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness, in like manner we also, having believed the voice spoken afresh through the Apostles of Christ, and that preached to us through the prophets, have renounced even unto death all things that are in the world. A nation then of like faith, religious and righteous (θεοσεβὴς καὶ δίκαιον), gladdening its father, God promiseth to him, *but not you,* "*in whom is no faith.*" (Deut. xxxii. 20.)'[1]

Let us now hear S. Irenæus discourse concerning the father of the faithful.

After quoting Genesis xiii. 14—17, and xv. 18, S. Irenæus proceeds as follows:—

'Thus, therefore, God promised him the inheritance of the land, but he received it not in all his time of sojourn. *He must receive it with his seed* (*that is, those who fear God and believe in Him*) *in the resurrection of the just. Now the Church is his seed,* receiving through the Lord the adoption which is towards God, as said John the Baptist, "since God is able[2] of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham." Moreover, the Apostle saith in his Epistle to the Galatians, "now ye, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise." (Gal. iv. 28.) And, again, in the same Epistle he plainly declares that they who have believed Christ, receive Christ, who was promised to Abraham.'[3]

He then quotes verses 16 and 6—9, from the third chapter of the same Epistle, and adds:—

'Thus, therefore, those who are of faith shall be blessed with faithful Abraham, and these are the sons of Abraham. But God promised the inheritance of the earth to Abraham and to his seed: and neither Abraham nor *his seed* (*that is, those who are justified by faith*) now acquire inheritance in it; but they shall receive it in the resurrection of the just. For God is true and stable, and therefore did He say, "blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth."'[4]

---

[1] Dial. cum Tryph. cap. 119, (tom. ii. p. 396. Ed. Otto.)

[2] We have here followed the reading given by Massuet: 'Per dominum adoptionem, quæ est ad Deum, accipiens.' Grabe has 'per Domini adoptionem,' &c., which leaves the participle 'accipiens' without any word governed by it.

[3] 'Sic ergo huic promisit Deus hæreditatem terræ, non accepit autem in omni
[illegible]o incolatu, *oportet eam accipere cum semine suo, hoc est, qui timent Deum et
[illegible]t in eum, in resurrectione justorum. Semen autem ejus Ecclesia, per
[illegible]um adoptionem, quæ est ad Deum, accipiens,*' &c.
[illegible]ic ergo qui sunt ex fide benedicentur cum fideli Abraham, et hi sunt filii

Much more will be found to the same effect. We will content ourselves with a single addition to the above. Having cited Isaiah xxx. 25, 26, S. Irenæus comments upon the latter part of the 26th verse. ('In the day that the Lord bindeth up the breach of his people, and healeth the stroke of their wound:' in his version, the *pain* of the wound or stroke, *dolorem plagæ.*)

'Now the pain of the stroke is that by which man was struck 'in the beginning, through disobedient Adam; that is, death, 'which God will heal, raising us from the dead, *and restoring us* '*into the inheritance of our fathers;* as again Isaiah saith, "then 'shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord; and I will cause thee 'to ride upon the high places of the earth, *and feed thee with the* '*heritage of Jacob thy father;* for the mouth of the Lord hath 'spoken it." But since the promises were proclaimed *not only* '*to the Prophets and Fathers, but also to the Churches gathered to-*'*gether out of the Gentiles* (which the Holy Spirit likewise terms 'the isles).[1] Jeremiah speaks as follows, [Jer. xxxi. 10—15.]:—

"Hear the word of the Lord, O ye nations,
And declare it in the isles afar off, and say,
He that scattered Israel will gather him,
And keep him, as a shepherd doth his flock.
For the Lord hath redeemed Jacob,
And ransomed him from the hand of him that was stronger than he.
Therefore shall they come and sing in the height of Zion,
And shall flow together to the goodness of the Lord, &c."'

S. Irenæus adv. Hæreses, v. 34. (*Ed. Grabe.*)

S. Irenæus subsequently quotes in the same spirit Isaiah xxxi. 9; xxxii. 1; liv. 11—14, and lxv. 18—23. The consideration of these passages will be found to throw light upon the views entertained by this ancient writer; for all, and especially the last, are replete with local references.

And here we must conclude our first section, simply remarking, that if any one, who has imbibed the spirit of such passages as the above, will compare their tone with that of the crowd of publications upon prophecy, which, wave-like ('*velut unda supervenit undam*'), rush over each other, as they issue from the

---

Abraham. Repromisit autem Deus hæreditatem terræ Abrahæ et semini ejus: et neque Abraham nequo *semen ejus (hoc est, qui ex fide, justificantur)* nunc sumunt in eâ hæreditatem: accipient autem in resurrectione justorum. Verus enim et firmus Deus, &c.'

[1] 'Dolor autem plagæ est, per quam percussus est homo initio in Adam inobediens, hoc est, mors, quam sanabit Deus resuscitans nos à mortuis *et restituens in patrum hæreditatem,* quemadmodum iterum Isaias ait (lviii. 14). . . . . Quoniam autem repromissiones *non solum Prophetis et Patribus, sed Ecclesiis et Gentibus coadunatis,* annunciabantur, quas et insulas nuncupat Spiritus.' We shall continue to give the original, either partially or in full, according to the rarity, the length, and the importance of the citation, following herein, in our humble way, what we imagine to be the rule laid down for himself by Mr. Grote, in his History of Greece.

press of the Messrs. Seeley, and similar bibliopolists, he will be struck with the utter contrast thus exhibited; and while he gives to the modern writers of his own land the fullest credit for good intentions, he will be conscious of an abrupt and painful descent from a region of thoughts ethereal and full of grandeur, to a land that must seem, in a very sad degree, narrow, earthly, and unspiritual.

II. In selecting a few of the remarks of those writers who, although unclaimed by our opponents, have not pronounced decisively against them, we may very possibly appear to be losing labour. But we are desirous, in the *first* place, of displaying some evidence of the generality of the conviction in favour of Jewish acceptance of our Lord in the latter days: and, *secondly*, of submitting to the reader's judgment the question, whether *the manner* in which these authorities have spoken of the *conversion* of Israel does not, for the most part, preclude the possibility of their having entertained the idea of a temporal restoration? Neither must it be forgotten that mere silence upon all sides affords a negative evidence, which is by no means alien from our inquiry.

Our first citation shall be from the writings of S. Hilary, the famous Bishop of Poitiers in the middle of the fourth century. He has a kind of right to be named first, for so beneficent was he to the race of Israel, that at his funeral 'the Jews were heard chanting in Hebrew their mournful psalms of lamentation for the Christian bishop.'[1] S. Hilary, in a passage which defies, we must own, our powers of full and exact construing, but of which the leading thought is sufficiently transparent, speaks as follows:—

'They are enemies indeed for our sakes, but beloved for the fathers' sakes: *the remnant of them is reserved for mercy.* Meantime they are dispersed among almost all nations, but by holy sprinkling shall they be set free.'[2]

And presently he continues:—

'And their impiety being laid aside, they shall be plucked away from lying and the curse, *and this in the consummation:* for when the fulness of the Gentiles shall have come in, then the remnant of Israel shall be saved. *But meanwhile the punishment of their desolation and dispersion awaits them:* although, for the fathers and the elect's sakes, this dispensation of mercy is reserved for the general consummation.'[3]

---

[1] Milman, Hist. of Jews, vol. iii. p. 200.

[2] 'Inimici quidem propter nos, sed dilecti propter patres: misericordiæ id quod eorum est reliquum reservatur. Dispersi quidem interim circum omnes ferè gentes, sed conspersione eorum sancta *atque radice* liberabuntur.' S. Hilarius in Psalmum lviii. Enaratio (pp. 487, 488. Ed. Basileæ, A. D. 1850). Another edition, printed at Wurzburg, reads *æque* for *atque;* but this is no improvement, and the *Ed. Wirceburgi* is not of high authority.

[3] 'Aversâque impietate de execratione ac mendacio avellentur, et *hoc in con-*

Now taking into account the confidence of the statement in one respect, and the entire absence of any like announcement in the writings of that saintly Prelate respecting a return of Israel into the *local* Palestine—observing how, in his judgment, even the conversion is reserved for the consummation of all things—we shall hardly be accused of forced or tortuous reasoning, if we assert that S. Hilary must be considered to favour the interpretations here set forth.

From France we must cross over to Egypt—no uncommon transit in these modern days. S. Cyril, the Archbishop of Alexandria at the beginning of the fifth century, ought to have enjoyed peculiar advantages for forming an opinion concerning Jewish hopes and prospects, seeing that he was dwelling in the very midst of one of their most wealthy and learned settlements. He coincides with the *Episcopus Pictaviensis*, just referred to, in speaking plainly on the one point and preserving the deepest silence on the other.

'That they shall receive mercy in the last times, being justified with us by the grace that is toward Christ the holy Scripture hath proclaimed.'

'The synagogue of the Jews, which, as it were, rejected Christ and cast Him away by its disobedience, shall receive Him in the latest times, being initiated into the faith by the voices of the Church.'[1]

Another name, which must be mentioned at this stage of our inquiry, is that of the great and eloquent bishop and metropolitan of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, S. Basil. (His date is a little later than S. Hilary's; Basil having been raised to the episcopate in A.D. 370, Hilary about A.D. 350.) He, too, has been enumerated among those who looked for a final triumph of the Cross over Jewish prejudice.[2] Of the correctness of such nomination we are not fully satisfied, but S. Basil certainly holds out no hopes of another Israelitish possession of the Holy Land. His *exegesis* of prophecy looks in quite an opposite direction. Witness the two following specimens. Upon the first verse of the fourteenth (our fifteenth) Psalm he observes:—

'The earthly Jew, when he hears mention of a hill, recurs to Sion.

---

summatione: quia cùm intraverit gentium plenitudo, tum quicquid Israel est reliquum salvabitur.—*Sed illos interim desolationis et dispersionis suæ manet pœna:* tametsi consummationi temporum propter patres et electos hæc dispensatio misericordiæ reservetur.'—*Ibid.*

[1] Ὅτι ἐν ἐσχάτοις ἐλεηθήσονται καιροῖς, τῇ εἰς Χριστὸν χάριτι μεθ' ἡμῶν δικαιούμενοι διεκήρυξε τὸ γράμμα τὸ ἱερόν.—S. Cyrillus Alexandr. in cap. i. Jesaiæ ad ver. 14, 15 (cit. ap. Suicer.) Ἐκθεμένη ὥσπερ τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἡ τῶν Ἰουδαίων συναγωγή, καὶ ἀποβαλοῦσα ταῖς ἀπειθείαις, ἐν τελευταίοις αὐτὸν καιροῖς παραδέξεται, ταῖς τῆς ἐκκλησίας μυσταγωγουμένη φωναῖς.—*Id.* lib. i. Glaphyra in Exod. p. 252 (cit. ibid.)

[2] Estius on Romans xi. thus mentions him. We have not been able to discover the passage, but Estius is usually so accurate, that the fault may very probably lie with us.

"Who shall dwell in thy holy hill?" he who hath lived as a sojourner in the flesh, he shall dwell in the holy hill; that hill, the land above the heavens, the land conspicuous and bright, concerning which the Apostle saith, that ye are come unto Mount Sion, the mount of the living God, wherein is the assembly of angels, and church of the first-born, which are written in heaven.'[1]

Commenting upon Isaiah iii. 10 ('they shall eat the fruit of their doings'), S. Basil alludes to the Jews leading Jesus bound unto Caiaphas (S. John xviii. 24), and proceeds as follows:—

'Now these are the fruits of their doings—captivity, dispersion, overthrow of the temple, the fall from their glory, their shame of countenance that permitteth them not to look up to God, by reason of the sin against the Only-begotten. Therefore have they lost their former boldness of speech, having neither prophets nor worship; but having bound the word, having bound the truth, having bound the light, having bound righteousness, having bound the Saviour, having bound the liberator (for Christ is all these according to the various ways in which we regard Him), they are deprived of light, they are deprived of the word, they are deprived of truth; they dwell with unrighteousness, their sickness is incurable. These are the fruits of their doings, which they eat.'[2]

The last whom we shall select from the list of those whom we believe we might justly include under the present category, shall be the greatest doctor of the Western Church, Aurelian Augustine. It may indeed be questioned whether the language of S. Austin does not express sentiments of so decided a nature as to class him with a different set of authorities—those, namely, who have *openly* testified their disbelief in what may be termed the *local* theory. But we have no desire to press evidence unduly, and prefer to be on the safe side. The following is but one out of many similar declarations of this Father:—

'Now that those carnal Israelites who now refuse to believe in Christ shall afterwards believe, that is to say, their sons (for they in truth will pass to their own place by death), the same prophet [Hosea] beareth

---

[1] Ἰουδαῖος μεν ὁ γήϊνος ὅταν ὄρος ἀκούσῃ, πρὸς τὸν Σιὼν ἀποτρέχει· τίς κατασκηνώσει ἐν τῷ ὄρει τῷ ἁγίῳ σου; ὁ τῇ σαρκὶ παροικήσας, ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ ὄρει κατασκηνώσει, ὄρος ἐκεῖνο τὴν ὑπερουράνιον χώραν, τὴν περιφανῆ καὶ λαμπράν· περὶ οὗ ὁ ἀπόστολος λέγει, ὅτι προσεληλύθατε Σιὼν ὄρος θεοῦ ζῶντος Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐπουρανίην, ἐν ᾗ πανήγυρις ἀγγέλων, καὶ ἐκκλησία πρωτοτόκων ἀπογεγραμμένων ἐν οὐρανοῖς.—S. Basilius, Homilia in Psalmum xiv. (xv.) (Tom. i. pp. 352, 353, Ed. Ben.) The text from Hebrews (xii. 22, 23) is probably quoted from memory, and therefore without precise exactness.

[2] ταῦτα δὲ ἐκείνων τῶν ἔργων τὰ γεννήματα, ἡ αἰχμαλωσία, ἡ διασπορὰ, ἡ καταστροφὴ τοῦ ναοῦ, ἡ ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης κατάπτωσις, ἡ αἰσχύνη τοῦ προσώπου αὐτῶν οὐκ ἐῶσα αὐτοὺς πρὸς θεὸν ἀναβλέπειν, διὰ τὴν εἰς τὸν μονογενῆ ἁμαρτίαν. ἀπώλεσαν οὖν τὴν προτέραν παῤῥησίαν, μήτε προφήτας, μήτε λατρείαν ἔχοντες· δήσαντες δὲ τὸν λόγον, δήσαντες τὴν ἀλήθειαν, δήσαντες τὸ φῶς, δήσαντες τὴν δικαιοσύνην, δήσαντες τὸν σωτῆρα, δήσαντες τὸν ἰατρὸν, δήσαντες τὸν ἐλευθερώτην· ἅπερ πάντα ἐστὶ κατὰ ποικίλην τὴν περὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπίνοιαν ὁ Χριστός· ἐστέρηνται φωτὸς, ἐστέρηνται λόγου, ἐστέρηνται ἀληθείας· ἀδικίᾳ συζῶσιν, ἀνίατα νοσοῦσιν. ταῦτά ἐστι τὰ γεννήματα τῶν ἔργων, ἃ ἐσθίουσιν.—S. Basilius in *Esai. Proph.* cap. iii. (Ed. Ben.)

witness saying, "For the children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice, without an altar, without a priesthood, without teraphim." Who cannot see that the Jews are at present in this state. But let us hear what he adds: "Afterwards shall the children of Israel return and seek the Lord their God, and David their king, and shall fear the Lord and his goodness in the latter days." *Nothing can be plainer than this prophecy*, when by the name of "*David, the king*," is understood to be meant Christ, "who was made," as saith the Apostle, "of the seed of David according to the flesh."'[1]

In another passage of the same great work, (a passage so often quoted, as to be almost trite and hackneyed to those who have given much attention to the subject) S. Augustine quotes Malachi iv. 5, 6, and then proceeds as follows:—

'It is a subject of most constant converse and meditation with the faithful, that the Jews (the law having been explained to them by this Elias, the great and marvellous prophet) will, in the last time before the judgment, believe in the true Christ, that is to say, in our Christ.'[2]

The reader will observe that a new element is here introduced, namely, an announcement of the particular means by which the ultimate conversion of the Jews was looked for, the return of Elijah to the earth. Now, were we disposed to play the part of special pleaders, a collection of the expressions of ancient writers upon this head might greatly aid our cause. For it would well-nigh double our list of writers, who belong to this second division, as having spoken plainly of the *spiritual* change expected to come over Judaism, while they totally ignored the idea of the local theory. But such a course would involve many disadvantages. Not only would it lengthen an inquiry already only too protracted, but it would mix up with our leading positions another of a somewhat different character. For although the expectation of Elias (accompanied, as some thought, by Enoch, or according to others, by Moses) is largely supported by patristic authority, and may probably have more countenance from Holy Writ than might be thought at the first glance, yet it does not stand upon precisely the same ground as the main question of the conversion itself. The two points,

[1] 'Istos autem carnales Israelitas, qui nunc nolunt credere in Christum, postea credituros, id est, filios eorum (nam utique isti in suum locum moriendo transibunt) idem Propheta testatur, dicens, &c. (Hosea iii. 4, the last words being in his version 'sine altari, sine sacerdotio, sine manifestationibus.') Quis non videat nunc sic esse Judæos? Sed quid adjungat audiamus (Hos. iii. 5. The conclusion is perhaps still more forcible than the E. V. given above: '*et stupescent* in Domino et in bonis ejus in novissimis diebus.') *Nihil est istâ prophetiâ manifestius*, cùm David regis nomine significatus intelligatur Christus, &c.' (Rom. i. 3.) —De Civ. Dei, lib. xviii. cap. 28.

[2] 'Per hunc Eliam magnum mirabilemque prophetam expositâ sibi lege, ultimo tempore ante judicium Judæos in Christum verum, id est in Christum nostrum, esse credituros, celeberrimum est in sermonibus cordibusque fidelium.'—De Civ. Dei. Lib. xx. cap. 29, (tom. vii. p. 613. Ed. Ben.) We translate with more freedom where the original is given as a check to undue license.

indeed, are often thus classed together by the ancients, but in subsequent ages the return of Elijah has been a matter of controversy, as the theological student may perceive by referring to the acrimonious comments of Maldonatus upon S. Matthew xvii. 10—12, which are directed *contra Calvinistas.* This is, with us, a reason for avoiding the topic for the present. Nevertheless, we must venture for other reasons to make one more quotation from the *De Civitate Dei*, in which this coming of the ascended prophet is mentioned with much confidence:—

'We have taught, then, that in that judgment, or in close connexion with that judgment, the following events will happen. The coming of Elijah the Tishbite; the conversion of the Jews; the persecution of Antichrist; the judgment by Christ; the resurrection of the dead; the separation of the good and the wicked; the conflagration of the world, and the renewal of the same. That all these things will come to pass is matter of faith; *but in what way or in what order they will happen, experience of facts will then teach, better than men's wits can now avail perfectly to attain to.* I think, however, that they will happen in that order in which I have considered them.'[1]

It must be owned that this is but a scanty list, when compared with the multitudinous array of events which the disciples of the modern school of prophecy place before us. They do not limit their decypherings of the future by that modest reference to the '*experientia rerum*,' which S. Austin here names as the great test of truth. Their large and extended range of vision includes alike the precise date of the world's end, and the duration of the Turkish Empire. True it is, that their predictions have again and again been falsified. The world has outlasted Whiston's assignation of its limit by the space of a century and a half: and the Ottoman rule in Europe (which Mr. Elliott, in the first edition of his 'Horæ Apocalypticæ,' had told us would cease and determine in the year of grace 1849,) has obtained in A.D. 1854 not merely the support of an Anglo-French alliance, but likewise a further grant of existence at the hands of no less a personage than the famous Dr. Cumming, who allows it the space of ten years more from the present time. But what of that? If this last calculation fail, the horoscope can be set again, and a fresh race of purchasers will easily be found. To us, we must confess, their tortuous, forced, and unauthorized explanations of God's Word but too often remind us rather of the tricks of pretended divination, than any sober and rational

[1] 'In illo itaque judicio vel circa illud judicium has res didicimus esse venturas, Eliam Thesbiten, fidem Judæorum, Antichristum persecuturum, Christum judicaturum, mortuorum resurrectionem, bonorum malorumque diremtionem, mundi conflagrationem, ejusdemque renovationem. Quæ omnia quidem ventura esse credendum est: sed quibus modis et quo ordine veniant, magis tunc docebit rerum experientia, quàm nunc valet consequi ad perfectum hominum intelligentia. Existimo tamen eo, quo à me commemorata sunt, ordine esse ventura.'—De Civ. Dei, lib. xx. cap. ult. (Tom. vii. p. 617, Ed. Ben.)

system of Christian *exegesis*. We have no great trust in political prophecy of any kind. Even the wisest statesmen are constantly found at fault, when they attempt it. But if we *must* take our choice, we avow frankly that the strong practical sense even of a Cobbett, is in our eyes more trustworthy than the *dictum* of any disciple of Bishop Newton.[1] The reprint of Cobbett's letters upon the formation of the kingdom of Greece, displays a real insight into probabilities, which, though the writer did not live to see them, have now become actualities. And the same might be said of many remarks of Arnold's and even of Alison's. But amidst the countless vaticinations of the school referred to, what proportion has been found to cast any real light upon the waves before us?

We know that these objections may give great offence to some, who demand for the most earthly and fallible interpretations of the Bible the reverence which is due to the Sacred Volume itself. But do they abide by their own rule? Will they treat with deference that notable argument which showed from Scripture, that the Papacy excelled the Imperial Power, *because* the first chapter of Genesis calls the Sun the *greater*, and the Moon the *lesser* light? Yet in what respect is this reasoning *more* forced than that of a writer, who first *assumes* (in direct opposition to all Jewish and all Christian commentators) that the 'Stone cut out without hands' in Daniel ii. 34, 45, is the British Empire, then imagines that his readers may reasonably be surprised at the idea of Great Britain absorbing all other kingdoms, and finally attempts to pacify them by gravely quoting the words, 'hath He said, and shall He not do it?' As if the very question at stake were not *whether He had said it.*

Strange, that the many excellent men who have adopted this mode of interpretation, are not made to pause by their reiterated failures, and led to suspect that there may be something unsound at the very basis of their structures. Such suspicion, however, does not seem to cross their minds, or if it arise, is immediately set aside again. Prejudices of education have often entwined the system with their entire inward life; or their own ingenuity, even if questionable, is too dear to let them re-commence on another plan; and when we see men of sense and ability thus hampered and entangled, we bethink us of the striking apologue which a living poet has placed in the mouth of the medieval mystic, Paracelsus. He likens himself to men

[1] Some readers may be put in mind of the second book of Cicero's *de Divinatione*. 'Num igitur, aut quæ tempestas impendeat, vates melius conjiciet, quam gubernator; aut morbi naturam acutius, quam medicus; aut belli administrationem, prudentius, quam Imperator, conjecturâ assequetur?' (Cap. v. *ad init.*)

who had to carry statues to distant isles, well worthy of the intended decoration. Tired of their long voyage, they land too soon upon wrong shores, and commence making shrines for the images; when the inhabitants of the true islands appear, and beg them to come on, for it is but a little way, and the groves are ready for the reception of these majestic forms:—

> 'Then we awoke with sudden start
> From our deep dream; we knew too late
> How bare the rock, how desolate,
> To which we had flung our precious freight:
> Yet we call'd out, "Depart!
> *Our gifts, once given, must here abide:*
> *Our work is done; we have no heart*
> *To mar our work, though vain*"—we cried.'[1]

And here perhaps the reader will expect some notice of the book which is placed at the commencement of this article. But if the length of our extracts from the works of men great in their generation, has already tried his patience, we must not run the risk of hopelessly annihilating what yet remains, by entering into much detail concerning a production of such very inferior and common-place character. The praise of good intentions on its author's part we willingly allow, but when we have said that, our meed of commendation is at an end. One or two specimens of the way in which this school of interpreters 'determine, from Scripture and from history,' the events of the future, will amply justify the brevity of our criticism.

In the first edition it was stated as probable that 'before the 'end of 1844 the Turkish Empire, or the reign of Moham-'medanism shall have ceased.'—P. 25. The second edition insinuates, that this announcement was practically fulfilled, inasmuch as in that year the Five Great Powers compelled Turkey to abandon the persecution of Christianity and Christian converts. But is it to be believed that this was anything like the sense which the Author had intended to convey? And if he *did* mean thus much, and no more, what value are we to attach to his auguries of what is still future?

In order to prove that the East India Company is to be 'the righteous power from the East,' foretold by the Prophet Isaiah, (xli. 1, 2,) our good deeds—on which a writer in the present number of this review speaks with some authority—in Hindostan are trumpeted forth, while nearly all that is bad or questionable is passed entirely *sub silentio*. Indeed, there are only two classes of persons, from whom so sycophantic an account of the rule of the Kings of Leadenhall Street could have proceeded: the one, the

[1] Lest we should seem to any to have misquoted, it must be observed that the wording of this passage differs in different editions of Mr. Browning's difficult, *but* really (we believe) deep and philosophic poem.

penmen who are writing for political and party purposes, the other, these modern students of unfulfilled prophecy. Compelled by the stern exigencies of their theories to state or ignore facts, just as may be suited to the scheme proposed, they treat the past as something entirely subservient to their own peculiar views of the future. When we have learnt to consider the stone cut out without hands which Daniel saw, to be the empire of Great Britain; when we are fully convinced that S. John the Divine means by the 'voices' of Revelation (xvi. 18.) 'quarrels, such as 'the quarrel with America about the burning of the ship 'Caroline, &c.' (p. 361); when we think it probable that Jonah in seeking to flee to Tarshish intended to flee to the British isles; then—but not till then—shall we look forward to the restoration of Israel to Palestine, at the hands of the East India Company. It is difficult to speak gravely of these interpretations of Holy Writ: nevertheless there are aspects in which they become very grave and very sad: for, while they may foster in those who trust them an eager, restless, and excited frame of mind, very alien from the true Christian temper, they may be found in other quarters to provoke a spirit of irreverence towards the Sacred Volume itself, and so ultimately tend to unbelief.[1]

III. We have proposed to consider the tone of feeling exhibited in some acts of Jews or Christians at particular epochs in history. This portion of our inquiry must of necessity be very meagre and scanty, for, if not compressed, it might be in danger of becoming a sketch of Jewish history.

Now it may be the result of ignorance or prejudice upon our part, but we only know of *three* facts which even *appear* to countenance, in any degree, the notion of a fresh occupation of Palestine by the Jews, in a state of power and political independence. These are 1. Their remarkable preservation as a distinct race; 2. The summoning of the Sanhedrim in Paris, A.D. 1807, by permission, or perhaps rather by command, of Napoleon Buonaparte; and 3. The continuous residence of a certain number in the Holy Land, from the close of the fourteenth century down to the present era. A few words upon each of these.

1. It is evident that the fact of the Jewish race remaining so separate and unmixed, finds its due place in the patristic, as well in the local, theory. If the Jews were to remain as living, though involuntary, witnesses to the truth of the religion and the prophecies of the Crucified; if at last they are to be converted (their own awful imprecation still clinging meanwhile to the unbelieving) it needs *must* be that they continue for the

[1] The argument on the stone just referred to is from this work.

present distinct from the other great families of mankind. It is impossible, therefore, to argue for the probability of their resumption of national independence and their ancient home from this circumstance, unless there be some far more cogent proof derivable from other and less debateable grounds.

2. At the summons of the Emperor Napoleon, a Sanhedrim of seventy-one Jewish doctors were gathered together. They were allowed to publish the result of their deliberations, and their brethren were admitted, under certain modifications, to the privileges of the French empire. The most distinguished British historian of the period calls this event a fulfilment of prophecy. We own that we are unable to perceive how this can be the case: and if it be argued that it is a kind of type and pledge of a fuller gathering hereafter to be made in Palestine, we can only repeat that so very shadowy a structure must be proved to rest upon a most solid basis before we can regard it as more than a fleeting and evanescent cloud.[1]

3. And, thirdly, we would fain inquire, with Hengstenberg, what is the value of a miserable life in Canaan (and the Jews there do, as a class, lead *most* miserable lives[2]) unless accompanied with special spiritual blessings? How can such an existence, as he justly asks, fulfil those promises, so rich, so glorious in their nature? Or how can it present hope for the future? This last query will receive a fuller reply, when we come to look, in our next section, at the general sentiments of Hengstenberg.

We must now glance briefly at a few counter-facts, if we may so call them. It must be frankly granted, that they are not weighty enough to stand as *proofs* of the correctness of our views. But as a key is probably the right one, which unlocks all the wards, however numerous and complicate, so *that* theory is probably true which does not hamper the array of facts with which it is concerned. We will mention some things, which either serve to indicate the mind of Christendom at certain periods, or which in other ways may serve as hints towards the formation of a just judgment. Of course, there is danger of our only selecting such facts as suit the positions here maintained. If, however, we unintentionally fall into this error, the critical reader will easily detect it.

(*a.*) How slow even Apostles proved at grasping the great truth, that the Gentiles were to become their fellow-heirs, is abundantly proved by the Book of Acts. How bitterly the unconverted Jews resented the bare idea of such a fellowship

[1] *Vide* Alison, Hist. of Europe, vol. x. (seventh edit.) The statutes are given, in epitome at least, by Milman. They are almost entirely political.

[2] Lists of subscription for their needs have recently appeared in the columns of the daily newspapers.

is displayed in the same sacred record, and even in the Holy Gospels.[1] But did our blessed Lord himself, did his Apostles, ever hold out any hopes that the captivity predicted by Him would, in a temporal sense, have any termination? Do the best commentators of any Christian community understand the fulfilment of 'the times of the Gentiles' (S. Luke xxi. 24) as prior to the general consummation? And is it not notorious to every student that we can not reason from the force of the word '*until*' in Scripture, as we might in writings originally composed in our own tongue? We shall most likely have occasion to recur to this point subsequently.

(*β.*) That strong antipathy between Jew and Christian, pourtrayed in Holy Writ, continued with unabated force for many centuries. (How far the milder feeling now prevalent may arise from any larger sense of true tolerance and charity, and how far from indifferentism and union in commercial pursuits, One alone can know, human motives being of so mixed a character.) We find S. Chrysostom, in his orations against the Jews,[2] urging Christians rather to endure sickness than send for a Jewish physician, though it is right to add that this injunction arose mainly from the belief that these doctors used charms and incantations to effect a cure. On the other hand, the Jews vexed, harassed, and (where they dared) persecuted the infant Church, in every conceivable way. We need not indeed adopt the severe language of Gibbon, and call the Jews 'enemies of the human race;' for the mind of Gibbon, as Milman justly observes, retained every vulgar prejudice against the race, whether regarded simply as Jews, or as the spiritual forefathers of Christians. But their *animus* against the Church is shown by countless deeds. How significant is that account of Jerome, (of which Dean Prideaux in his famous work reminds us), unable even to get a lesson in Hebrew except by stealth, and with the aid of heavy bribes. How remarkable the circumstance pointed out by Milman, that 'whenever occasion offered 'the Jews sided with the Arian faction, while the Arians were 'in general more tolerant towards the worshippers of the undi-'vided unity of God than the Catholic Church.' Yes! for between the Jew and the heretic, the unbeliever in Christ and the impugner of his perfect Godhead, there lay a common bond —the hatred of the truth, and the wish to overthrow it. Here was the true *idem velle ac nolle:* here was there exhibited that

[1] Compare Acts xiii. 44—50, and xxii. 21—23, with S. Luke iv. 25—29; and see on this last passage the admirable '*Plain Commentary*' published by Parker (Oxford).

[2] The passages are given by Suicer. (Thesaurus sub voce 'Ιουδαῖος.)

[3] Our references to Milman always mean the third vol. of his 'History of the Jews.'

instinct of impiety, than which, it has most truly been asserted, nothing can be more infallible.[1] And when, at an earlier period, that Jewish revolt under Adrian had failed; when the son of a star, Barchochĕbas,[2] was called by his deluded countrymen Barcosba, the son of a Lie; when the very name of the Holy City was abolished for a new title (composed of the Emperor's *prænomen* and an epithet of the Roman Jupiter), Ælia Capitolina; in what terms do Christian writers speak of the simultaneous edict which forbade any Jew to enter the capital of his native land?

Eusebius and Tertullian, S. Justin, S. Gregory Nazianzen, S. Jerome, S. Hilary, and S. Chrysostom, have all alluded to this remarkable law.[3] *But not one among them hints at any hope of a national restoration in store for Israel*, and some have expressed their conviction that such an event was never destined to take place. We submit that even silence is, in such cases, full of meaning. The Church, in that age, acknowledged no such interpretation of prophecy.

(γ.) In connexion with this heathen appellation of Jerusalem, Eusebius records a scene of very singular character. During the persecution of Diocletian, which commenced in A.D. 305, five Egyptians were apprehended as Christians. They had adopted, instead of their birth-names, those of ancient prophets, Elijah, Jeremiah, Isaiah, Samuel, and Daniel, that they might, says the historian, 'display the inward Jew and genuine Israel of God not only in their deeds, but in their very names.' The judge demanded of one that he should specify his country. He answered, in harmony, adds Eusebius, with his name, 'that 'Jerusalem was his country, meaning *that*, of which it has been 'said by Paul, Jerusalem which is above, &c.' (Gal. iv. 26 and Heb. xii. 22 are quoted.) The judge, perplexed by the reply, tortured the Egyptian, in order to discover the position of this city, conceiving that the Christians were about to erect some town that should be hostile and troublesome to the Romans. The sufferer still maintained the truth of his assertion, merely adding 'that it was a country of God's worshippers alone (*τῶν θεοσεβῶν*, as opposed to idolaters), and that it lay towards the east and the rising sun.' He and his brethren all won the crown of martyrdom.[4]

---

[1] 'Rien n'est plus infaillible que l'instinct de l'impieté.'—De Maistre.

[2] Βαρχωχεβᾶς ὄνομα (ἀστέρα δηλοῖ τοῦτο.) Euseb. H. E. iv. 6.

[3] The authorities have been collected by Valesius in a valuable note to Euseb. H. E. lib. iv. cap. 6; and again, with slight variety, by Dr. Münter, cited by Rev. G. Williams (Holy City, vol. i. p. 213). Neither has mentioned S. Chrys. Orat. V. cont. Jud., or S. Hilar. in Psal. lviii.

[4] Euseb. de Martyribus Palestinæ. (H. E. tom. ii. pp. 626, 627, ed. Burton, Oxon., A.D. 1838.)

Now what are the natural conclusions from this history? We gladly adopt the comment of one, who (perhaps alone among living writers of weight and authority) seems rather inclined to espouse a view of prophecy contrary to ours.

'The narrative is instructive as demonstrating, first, how entirely the very memorial of the ancient name of Ælia had perished, when it was so strange to the Roman procurator of Palestine, that he thought it must be a city which the Christians were erecting in defiance of the government; and secondly, as *proving how fully the Christian's mind was imbued with the persuasion that the earthly type had been superseded by the heavenly reality.*'[1]

May we not, then, claim some countenance to our cause from the ranks of 'the noble army of Martyrs?'

(δ.) The revolters under Adrian had hoped to rebuild the temple. A similar movement under Constantine aimed at like objects; and failed in the same manner. But a third attempt, with the sanction and aid of the apostolic Julian, was likewise made. This too was frustrated, *and how? By the special and miraculous interposition of God Himself.* Of all miracles, saving and excepting those recorded by inspired penmen, there is not one, perhaps, so well attested and confirmed as this. The leading facts have received not merely the witness of Christian preachers and historians, but the unsuspicious testimony of the heathen annalist, Ammianus Marcellinus. Warburton, by no means a man of credulous disposition, has established its truth in a most copious and cogent dissertation. We remember to have heard a professor in an English university declare that the rejection of this miracle seemed to involve an unwarrantable degree of scepticism; and even Gibbon writes concerning it, as one perplexed what to advance. Yet, if the miraculous nature of this interference be once admitted, does it not best harmonize with the opinions of those who do *not* look for any resuscitation of the earthly stock of Abraham as a nation? So, at least, thought a great and saintly prelate of that generation, whose words will be cited subsequently in the latter portion of our critique.

(ε.) The theology of the Middle Ages, dogmatic rather than exegetical, meddled but little apparently with such questions as the one before us. Anselm never once refers to them. In the famous *Summa Theologiæ* of Aquinas, scarcely any notice is taken of the Jews of that age, excepting in connexion with the startling doctrine that the faithful have dominion over the goods of these unbelievers. The great poem of Dante is equally silent respecting them. But, however contemptuous the silence, however tremendous *their* state of servitude (and the picture in Scott's Ivanhoe seems but too well founded), the highest

[1] Rev. G. Williams. Holy City, vol. i. p. 233.

authority was frequently exerted in their favour. S. Hilary of Poitiers has already been mentioned as their benefactor. And in medieval times, 'of all European Sovereigns, the popes, with 'some exceptions, pursued the most humane policy towards the 'Jews.'[1] But neither S. Hilary nor any pope (so far as we are aware) ever held out to them any prospect of a return to Palestine. There was, indeed, a mighty movement in those days for the recovery of the Holy Land, but most assuredly it was not made on behalf of its former possessors. Is there one single hint to such effect in any document connected with the Crusades? We have never seen nor heard of such. Our appeal to those expeditions need not include any question of their merits. The reader may, with the sceptic Hume, regard them as 'the most durable monument of human folly;' with Dr. Arnold and Sir Francis Palgrave, condemn them as utterly anti-Christian; with Professor Smyth palliate them; with Bishop Heber, almost defend them. In any case he must admit them as a great fact, and they certainly tend to show that the notions we are engaged in combating could hardly have existed then. The Crusaders fearfully maltreated the Jews; but the barbarity thus exhibited towards that devoted race was not sanctioned by the medieval Church. Pope Eugenius the Third did all in his power to repress it.

Pope Eugenius had a friend, in all but station, far greater than himself. Did we wish to make the most of the authority of the holy Abbot of Clairvaux, we would quote that glowing apostrophe to Jerusalem in his address to the Knights Templars, which glides so naturally and easily from the earthly to the spiritual city. But the following letter is more curious, and surely must have sufficed to place S. Bernard in the preceding section, had we not preferred to reserve his observations for this place:—

'For the rest, brethren, I warn you, yet not I, but the Apostle of God with me, that ye "*believe not every spirit.*" We have heard, and with joy, that the zeal of God glows within you; but it thoroughly needs to be combined with the tempering restraint of knowledge. *The Jews are not to be persecuted, they are not to be slain, they are not even to be chased away.* Ask them [the persecutors] for Holy Writ. I know what is read in the Psalm, as prophesied of the Jews. "*God showeth me,*" saith the Church, "*of mine enemies, slay them not, lest my people forget it.*" They are to us as living monuments, showing forth the Passion of the Lord. Therefore have they been scattered into all lands, that while they undergo the just punishment of so heinous a crime, they may be the witnesses of our redemption. And hence, in the same Psalm, the Church further saith, "*scatter them by thy*

[1] Milman, vol. iii. p. 300. His pages, and those of Gibbon, are our authorities for what immediately follows. Why a distinguished orator in the House of Commons lately contradicted Milman's account of the Papal behaviour, we do not understand.

power and put them down, O Lord, our defence." And thus hath it come to pass; they are scattered, they are put down; they endure a hard captivity under Christian princes. "*Yet shall they be converted at eventide,*" and in season shall regard be had to them. Lastly, when the fulness of the Gentiles shall have come in, "*then,*" saith the Apostle, "*all Israel shall be saved.*" Meanwhile, indeed, he that dieth, abideth in death.'[1]

Here we observe the same features—firm hopes of Jewish spiritual conversion; no thought of Jewish temporal restoration. In connexion with S. Bernard's defence of the Jews, and hopes concerning them, there has occurred in our own age a circumstance of touching interest. Two biographies of that devoted servant of God have lately been given to the world, each the production of eminent men, one a Protestant, one a Roman Catholic. The authors were the historian Neander and M. Ratisbonne; *both converts to Christianity from Judaism.*[2]

(ζ.) The Reformation did not, we think, greatly change the feelings of any classes of Christians towards the Jews. Indirect benefits they doubtless gained in time from the growing spirit of general toleration; but, so far as theology is concerned, the views of the chief Reformers seem to have been even more severe, if possible, towards the Jews, and more hopeless of their spiritual amelioration than those of the unreformed communions.

(η.) A glance at the Israelites themselves, if it does not tend to confirm our views, will at least show nothing to annul or weaken them. The lineal descendants of Abraham have generally adopted one of four lines of conduct. 1. They have been among those who are devoted to the pursuit of wealth, and care but little for the law of Moses or the valleys of Canaan;

> 'With dumb despair their country's wrongs behold,
> And dead to glory, only burn for gold.'

How the higher and more successful votaries have influenced European politics, and won, at least, an *outward* deference from

---

[1] 'De cetero, fratres, moneo vos, non autem ego, sed Apostolus Dei mecum, non esse credendum omni spiritui. Audivimus et gaudemus, ut in vobis ferveat zelus Dei: sed oportet omnino temperamentum scientiæ non deesse. Non sunt persequendi Judæi, non sunt trucidandi, sed nec effugandi quidem. Interrogate eos divinas paginas. Novi quid in Psalmo legitur prophetatum de Judæis: *Deus ostendit mihi,* inquit Ecclesia, *super inimicos meos; ne occidas eos, nequando obliviscantur populi mei.* VIVI quidam apices nobis sunt, repræsentantes Dominicam passionem. Propter hoc dispersi sunt in omnes regiones, ut dum justas tanti facinoris pœnas luant, testes sint nostræ redemptionis. Unde et addit in eodem Psalmo loquens Ecclesia: '*Disperge illos in virtute tuâ, et depone eos, protector meus Domine.*' Ita factum est: dispersi sunt, depositi sunt; duram sustinent captivitatem sub principibus Christianis. '*Convertentur tamen ad vesperam,*' et in tempore erit respectus eorum. Denique cum introierit gentium multitudo, '*tunc omnis Israel salvus erit,*' ait Apostolus. Interim sane qui moritur, manet in morte.'—Epist. cccIxiii. (Tom i. p. 328, Ed. Mabillon, A.D. 1690.)

[2] We must thank a friend for pointing out to us this incident.

Christian merchants, kings, and statesmen; how 'the filthy 'habits, the base frauds, and the miserable chicanery of many 'of their lower orders,'[1] have chilled the feelings of those who would fain take interest in them; *this* is not the place to recount; both phases are indelibly stamped upon the page of history and daily experience. Clearly these are not the men of whom it is possible to expect any great things either in a religious or temporal point of view. They would not, as a class, undergo any great sacrifices to regain the land of their forefathers, far less for the attainment of blessings which are purely spiritual.

2. But another set of Jews did worse. In Spain many pretended to be Christians, and rose to high offices in Church and State, retaining in secret the creed of Judaism alone. The end of that fearful hypocrisy is written, too, in history, and upon one of its most terrible and blood-stained pages.[2] Yet, shocking and wholly indefensible as was the mode of trial then prevalent throughout Europe, and pushed to its furthest extent in the proceedings of the Spanish Inquisition, the wickedness of this covert Judaism, the life of blasphemous deceit it must have entailed on its professors, is not therefore palliated or left unreproved. It is a strange proof that genius and clearness of vision may be utterly dimmed by preconceived theories and national prejudice, that this life of falsehood has been proclaimed in the ablest political novel of our day, without one sentence or syllable of reprobation. But such Jews could never, in their inmost hearts, be hoping for the blessings either of earth or heaven.

3. A third class there is, who must certainly deserve the attachment of those Christians who expect to see Israel, as a nation, again in Israel—a class to which we are very far from refusing a large measure of respect and sympathy. We mean the patriots among the Jews—Talmudists, poets, pilgrims to Jerusalem. It speaks indeed but little for the value of Rabbinical studies, that so few have been led by them to Him 'of whom Moses in the law and the prophets did write;' it is sad to read of a most learned Rabbi, Akiba, throwing his lot with the impostor, Barchochĕbas. But these were not (speaking generally) either sordid or deceitful sons of Israel. They toiled and thought, they dared and suffered. Such an one, at the commencement of the twelfth century, was Jehuda Ben Halēvy, a learned Talmudist, an earnest patriot, a fervid

[1] Milman.

[2] Mr. Prescott's 'Ferdinand and Isabella' will be found tion on this head.

poet, whose strains, we believe, are yet sung by his brethren on the anniversary of the burning of the temple:—

'May my tongue be parch'd and cleave
Fast to my mouth's roof; and wither
This right hand, should I forget
Ever thee Jerusalem!

Words and air, incessantly
Ring they in my head to-day;
And I hear a sound of voices,
Manly voices, chanting psalms.

Oft-times flitting come before me,
Beards, those long and shadowy beards—
Dreamy phantoms, which among ye
Is Jehuda Ben Halēvy?

But they hurry swiftly past;
Spectres timorously shun
Our rude converse here on earth—
Still, I recognised his face.

I knew him by the pale expanse
Of clear and lofty-thoughted brow,
By the firm gaze of those sweet eyes,
That look'd so sadly questioning.

But, chief of all, I recognised
The mystic and peculiar smile,
(Made by the fine half-parted lip)
Which none, save poets only, wear.

Years come forth and quickly vanish.
There have past now since the birth
Of Jehuda Ben Halēvy,
Seven hundred and fifty years.

First did he behold the daylight
At Toledo in Castile,
And for him the golden Tagus
Murmur'd sweet his cradle song.'

Such is the wild and beautiful opening of a poem upon Jehuda which a German, himself of Hebrew parentage, has lately given to the world.[1] But, alas for Jehuda! that his journeyings did not bring him to the true Jerusalem: and doubly alas for this bard who glorifies his memory! for Heinrich Heine believes, we fear, neither in Christ, nor even (Judaically) in Moses. We cannot recommend the study of Heine's writings, any more than one can recommend the study of our countryman Shelley. Yet Shelley has his blameless pieces; and some of these (as his ode to the skylark) have evidently been read, and even imitated, by writers of sacred

[1] Romanzero, von Heinrich Heine. Hamburg, A.D. 1852. We are sadly con- is in diction and music of rhythm inflicted upon Heine's verses by

poetry. And thus, too, in the lay before us, Heine has almost entirely laid aside that *esprit malin et moqueur* with which a French critic has justly charged him, and which an English translator, Mr. Akerlos, has done his best to make known by selecting the most offensive poem in the *Romanzero*, and prefixing to it a preface, if possible, more objectionable still. But if the composition called *Disputation* be even worse than anything in *Queen Mab*, it may yet be excusable to look for a moment upon Heine's portrait of one of his own race; and we therefore give, as indirectly bearing upon our subject, one more sample —these picturesque descriptions of an earnest Hebrew, and his feelings towards Jerusalem below. After a long account of the young student's mental progress, he is compared, as a minstrel, to the Troubadours. Like them, Jehuda had an object of affection, but not, says the poet, a Laura, nor a Châtelaine presiding over tilt and tourney:—

'She, the loved one of the Rabbi,
Was a poor and mournful choice,
Ruin's melancholy image,
And her name—Jerusalem.

Even in early childhood's day
Was she his entire love;
Made his very heart to tremble
Even the word—Jerusalem.

Purple glowing on his cheeks,
Rose the youth, and listening stood,
When a pilgrim to Toledo
Came from the far Morning-Land;

And told his tale; how desolate,
How polluted now the spots,
Where of prophet's footsteps yet
Shone on earth the luminous track.

Where the air yet breathed of balsam,
From the eternal breath of God.
Oh! the woful aspect!
* * * *

She, the crowded holy city,
Hath a wilderness become;
Where the satyr, wolf, and jackal
All their wild existence urge.

Serpents, birds of night, are nestling
By the weather-beaten walls;
From a window's airy arches
Gazes, with delight, the fox.

Here and there break forth at moments
Ragged ones, the Desert's sons,
Who, their high-back'd camels leading,
Feed them mid the long-grown grass.

On the noble height of Zion,
Where the golden firmament
By its glories erst bare witness
To Jehovah's pomp on high.

There, with weeds entwined and tangled,
Prostrate lie the ruins grey;
Ruins to our gaze so mournful,
That one must believe they weep.

And, in sooth, they seem as weeping
Once a year, upon *that* day,
Ninth day of the month called Ab:
Yea! myself, with weeping eyes,

Saw amaz'd the thick drops trickling
From the massive stones around;
While the broken Temple pillars,
Sent abroad a wailing sound.'

Such are supposed to have been the pictures (in themselves as truthful as they are full of pathos) which drew Jehuda ben Halevy to Jerusalem, where he perished by the lance of a Saracen. Certainly, such words, if any, might move one to sympathy with the Israelites, who still yearn, like Jehuda, to win back those terrestrial homes; but, before we indulge in any further comment, let us listen to an authentic description of the *present* condition of such as follow in his footsteps. Thus speaks concerning them Dr. Macgowan, an English physician of some eminence, who accompanied the late Bishop Alexander to Jerusalem:—

'The most prominent trait in their character is a devoted attachment to the land of their fathers, and especially to the holy city of Jerusalem. This, however, is combined with many peculiar notions of a superstitious nature, which excite mingled feelings of compassion and respect. To live and die in this sacred spot, is, in their opinion, attended with extraordinary privileges, both temporal and spiritual. Released from the cares and business and tumult of the world, their lives are to be exempt in a greater degree from the common infirmities of human nature, and spent in an uninterrupted enjoyment of peaceful, calm, and holy meditation. Their prayers are to ascend with more fervent rapture to the throne of the Most High; their nights are to be favoured with celestial visions, and communion with angelic beings; and, finally, at the close of their mortal life, their souls shall be at once received into eternal glory. Such are the exaggerated privileges of the Jewish inhabitants in the Holy City, the anticipation of which annually attracts vast numbers from all parts of the world to its walls. But, with the majority, these high-wrought expectations are soon followed by disappointment. The novelty of the scenes and places connected with religious association soon dies away, and is succeeded by the aspect of their real desolation. The wretchedness of their dwellings, *the scarcity and dearness of provisions, the sickliness of the climate*, the want of all occupation, except the study of the Talmud, and the cold lifeless round of formal devotions—these, and many other circumstances, of which impoverished means are too often an accompaniment—damp the spirits of the new comer, and chill his enthusiasm. His disappointment is

deep, as his hopes had been elevated, and ends in a state of mind bordering on despair, or, more commonly, in listless apathy. Their persons, their dress, and houses, all bear a neglected air; their means become exhausted, their health fails, and they die, leaving their families supported by a pittance from the synagogue. There are numbers of widows and orphans in Jerusalem who have thus lost their husbands and parents, and whose peculiar history and destitution render them objects of more than ordinary interest. Neglect, poverty, and disease, are their portion, with an utter want of religious instruction.' [1]

We have given both the poetry and the prose of the case, and are therefore in a position to take a *conspectus*, as it were, of the whole. On the one hand, it must be acknowledged that the condition of Palestine and Jerusalem, and the Jewish race, is a spectacle full of woe and sadness; and that the hopes of a national restoration of that unhappy people appeal to many of our deepest and most natural instincts, our own love of home, our notions of the *prestige* derived from previous long possession, our very spirit of patriotism itself. But, on the other hand, let it be well considered, that a Jewish possession of Canaan must involve many miraculous interpositions; not merely interference with the political conditions of other nations, (which happen in every age,) but positive renewal of the country's climate and immense enlargement of its capacity for the sustenance of human life. But all this is promised, say our opponents. Ah! that is the very question at issue between us. We have given *some* reasons, and shall proceed to give *more*, for thinking that it is *not* promised. Even a restoration of Jerusalem, if it were to take place, *need* not include a return of the Jews to the Holy Land. If their possession were of long duration, their exclusion has already lasted longer. The Canaanites lost the land for ever by reason of their iniquities; why may not the Jews, too, have lost it finally, seeing that they have sinned yet more fearfully and against greater light? There is no greater difficulty in their suffering for the sins of their forefathers until the consummation of all things, than there is in the entire human race undergoing the penalty of Adam's sin until that same most blessed regeneration be accomplished. Doubtless, God can, if it please Him, do all, and abundantly more than all, that is required for the temporal restoration of His ancient people. But it is not—with reverence be it said—it is not at all in accordance with the analogy of His general dealings, *that He should simply do again what has once been undone.* Penitence can never be like innocence: our first parents never regained

[1] We are indebted for this extract to a publication which takes a view of prophecy opposite to that maintained by us. Dr. Macgowan seems to have displayed a most praiseworthy and touching solicitude both for the bodies and souls of these poor creatures.

the earthly Paradise from which they were expelled. And if our interpretation of prophecy seem to any to be a cold and hard-hearted one, such students of Holy Scripture will, we are sure, be ready to admit that the primary question is, whether it be *true*. If it be well-founded and correct, we may safely leave the rest in the hands of Him by whose Spirit the prophets spake. And, on this point, even a book of the Apocrypha may perhaps read us a moral lesson. When the pseudo-Esdras, writing probably in the second century of the Christian era, lamented over 'the travail of Jacob and the wearisome toil of 'the stock of Israel'—when he grieved that 'this one people,' if it must be punished, should be suffering at the hands of the heathen, rather than from *direct* judgments of God Himself—then 'the angel,' he writes, 'that came to me the night afore 'was sent to me, and said unto me, Hear me, and I will instruct 'thee; hearken to the thing that I say, and I shall tell thee 'more. And I said, Speak on, my Lord. Then said he unto 'me, *Thou art sore troubled in mind for Israel's sake: lovest thou 'that people better than He that made them?*'[1]

No: *if* these views be based upon God's truth, they must be the wisest, must be the most just, must be at the same time the most merciful. If we are not disposed to look forward to a Jewish repossession of the Holy Land, it is because we have learnt to anticipate for them a far higher and more glorious destiny. It is often thus with individual souls; though the repentant be not as the innocent, yet can God, of his great mercy, overrule to good past evil, and grant to fervid penitence a place in His kingdom higher than that accorded to a less active innocence. It is thus with mankind at large; though neither Adam nor their descendants can win back again the garden of Eden, yet shall the bliss of the redeemed in Heaven above be greater and more precious far than could ever have been the lot of the first pair in their home on earth. And thus, too, with reference to the lineal sons of Abraham. If we are not disposed to anticipate for them a national re-erection and return to Canaan, it is partly because we do firmly believe that there are in store for them more glorious things than these. To own the great crime of which they inherit the miserable results; to repent of it, and be again at peace with God and in His favour; to be once more the vanguard of the armies of the Lord of Hosts against the adversaries of His righteous will; to shew forth the truth of the Divine promises in the full sight of the Church and of the world—a consolation to the one, a warning to the other—these are blessings nobler, grander, more

[1] 2 Esdras, v. 28—33, 35.

exalted far, than the possession of a few square miles of territory, even though its associations be justly dear and hallowed, even though it should be restored to fruitfulness, and flow, as of old, with milk and honey.

We must shortly proceed to examine the writings of those great men, who are masters in that school of prophetic interpretation wherein we are only humble pupils. But before we conclude this division of our subject, it is only reasonable to turn for a moment to the disciples of the schools opposed to ours, and demand to whom *they* make appeal as *their* authorities in the questions now before us. If we be unable to reply on their behalf, we can at least mention some names of weight, to whom, we believe, they cannot or do not look for countenance. They cannot appeal to the Ante-Nicene Fathers of the Church, for even the Chiliasts among these have been fully shewn, we trust, to hold a different doctrine; they cannot appeal to the great doctors of the fourth and fifth centuries, for these, when they do not contradict, at any rate ignore the idea of a Jewish return to Palestine; they cannot appeal to the honoured names of the middle ages—a Bernard, an Anselm, an Aquinas; they do not produce one favourable sentence from the works of the leading Reformers, whether English or continental; and among the most valuable commentaries upon Holy Scripture, Papal or Protestant, which have been published since the epoch of the Reformation, most scanty (if we err not) is the list of such supporters as can be accounted of any real and solid weight.

It is to be found in the 'Dissertations' of Bishop Newton, who fixes the return of the Jews for the time when the Turks fall, and Antichrist is destroyed.[1] The presence, however, of the theory in Bp. Newton's book is almost tantamount to a proof that it is *prior* to his time, since no one ever accused that writer of having produced an original idea. Some readers may possibly recollect the sentiments of Newton's contemporary, Dr. Johnson, upon this point. We must own that we have never been able to dissociate them from the work since Dr. S. R. Maitland, in one of his really valuable tracts upon Prophecy, rather cruelly reminded us of their existence. For the benefit of those who may not be able to call them to mind, they shall here be given in a foot-note.[2]

But Newton refers us to a much greater man, the true

[1] Vol. iii. p. 407. Ed. Lond. 1766.

[2] Dr. Adams. 'I believe his "Dissertations on the Prophecies" is his great work.' Johnson. 'Why, Sir, it is *Tom's* great work; but how far it is great, or how much of it is Tom's, are other questions; I fancy a considerable part of it was borrowed.'—Croker's Boswell's Johnson, vol. v. p. 185. Johnson had been provoked by Newton, and thought meanly of his character: but it does not follow that his characterisation of the work is incorrect.

antistes of this school of prophecy—'the pious and profoundly learned' Joseph Mede. The great merits of Mede, and the consequent injury that he has done towards the proper study of prophecy in this land, perpetually remind us of the somewhat hackneyed line in Addison's Cato:—

'Curse on his virtues: they've undone his country.'

But we are learning to gaze upon the mischief with more equanimity in consequence of our deep conviction, that not even the name of Mede can long resist, in the judgment of real theologians, the continuous blows which are now assailing his authority, as a guide in prophetic interpretation. There has been published, in the first place, that most weighty *Concio* of Bishop Pearson, recovered by the watchful care of Archdeacon Churton, who has fortified the case against Mede by recording in his preface the opinions of Dr. Burton and Bishop Horsley.[1] From American Protestantism has come a book by Moses Stuart, in the same direction. Germany sends the most reverent and non-rationalistic of her interpreters of prophecy, Hengstenberg. Among British Nonconformists, an apparently able reasoner, Mr. Bonar, follows on the same side.[2] In the English Church may be mentioned, with special honour, Dr. S. R. Maitland and Dr. Todd, whose arguments made Bp. Copleston pause and refrain from publishing in support of the views of Mede. The list might easily be enlarged; but at present we will only say that, in such company, we are content to decline acceptance of Mede's system without entering into speciality of detail.

But can those who differ from us name any earlier or greater authority than this single one of Mede? 'I look back,' said the late excellent Mr. Bickersteth, in an address delivered at Bath in A.D. 1841, 'to the *old* expositors of 200 years since—Brightman, 'Mede, Tillinghast, and Durham.' 'These all agree,' he adds, 'in connecting the fate of the Turkish Empire with the resto-'ration of the Jews.' But is there one of them, excepting Mede, whose writings now possess the slightest influence upon the mind of Christendom?

There are indeed some sober expositors, who go so far as to adopt the view given by Hammond in his Paraphrase upon S. Luke xvi. 24, that 'Jerusalem shall again be inhabited by 'Jewish, as well as Gentile, Christians.' But this expectation, however doubtful, is more like the tone of S. Justin Martyr and S. Irenæus, than that of our modern English school.

[1] Concio IV. ad Clerum. Pearson's Minor Works, vol. ii. p. 44. Bp. Horsley, *British Magazine*, No. xxxiv. p. 73. Dr. Burton, Bampton Lectures, note 60, p. 436.

[2] Bonar on the Development of Antichrist.—Partridge & Co. For Hengstenberg and Stuart, see *Christian Remembrancer*, vol. xxvi. p. 383.

Meanwhile, therefore, until the contrary be distinctly proved, *we must venture to regard the belief in a return of Israel to Canaan as a Judaic notion; which has, during the last two centuries, been trying, as it were, to creep into the Church; and which will be compelled, on further examination, to retire again to the Synagogue whence it sprung.*

4. We mentioned four leading classes of Jews. Our final category was not intended to consist of those who, in the provinces of musical art, philosophy, or literature, had won fame and influence in the world. Such Israelites, however they may have proved that genius is not extinct in their race, would hardly, even if considered as a distinct class, have much connexion with our present subject. But we were thinking of those descendants of Abraham who had from time to time bowed down before the uplifted Cross. Even here there may often have rested—there must often still rest—the sad shade of suspicious motives. But dishonest conversions, though miserable for the pretenders themselves, have often benefited others. The children of the hypocrite may prove 'Israelites indeed, in whom there is no guile.' And even since the cessation of the *extra*ordinary Pentecostal gifts, the Almighty has ever suffered some of His ancient people to be converted here and there, and now and then, one may trust as a pledge and earnest of the brighter day in store, the larger in-gathering yet to come. Such, for example, were those Israelites in Crete, of whose singular conversion (after experience of the delusions of a false prophet) the historian Socrates has given us an account.[1] Such, we will hope, were those for whom our English Henry III. erected a house of maintenance between the old and the new Temple in the metropolis.[2] Such, too, the multitudes, whom a holy Spaniard, S. Vincent Ferrer, is reported to have won over in the fifteenth century. Such, many single converts of great eminence, witnesses and examples to their brethren; as Nicolas de Lyra, a commentator of repute (and, if we err not, one of our school of *exegesis)*; such, Jerome *de Sanctâ Fide*, a physician of name in Italy; such, Carettus and Emmanuel Tremellius. And, in this matter, we are glad to notice a thought of Mede's, very modestly proposed by him in a letter to a friend.[3] He suggests whether it may not be possible that the great Apostle of the Gentiles, who was by birth and education so completely an 'Hebrew of the Hebrews,' may prove to have been in his con-

[1] Socrates, Hist. Ecclesiast. lib. vii. cap. 38. Cf. Milman, vol. iii. p. 195.

[2] Camden's Britannia and Stowe's Survey, as cited by Fuller in his 'Pisgah-sight of Palestine.' (London, A. D. 1650.)

[3] Mede, Epistle xiv.

version a type[1] of that national one which appears to be foretold. *He* had been a fierce persecutor of the Church of God, so have *they* been collectively. He was brought to the truth by a vision and a voice; may not some such blessed marvel be in store for them; and the declaration of the Saviour, that they should not see Him till they should say, 'Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord,' receive in this way a most literal and complete fulfilment?

Oh great and blessed day, in whatsoever way it please God to vouchsafe to bring it about! Great masters of language have ofttimes kindled into eloquence as they described the sins and punishments of Israel; but who has written worthily—who *can* write worthily—of the blessedness of that thorough union of the walls of the great building in Him, who is the chief corner-stone?

IV. In appealing to the judgments of ancient writers upon prophecy, we have not intended to imply that their opinions upon its interpretation deserve the same respect as their enunciations on dogmatic theology. Concerning *dogmas*, they deliver not merely their own sentiments, but the general belief of the Church of their own times. 'This we hold, this we received, this is the faith once delivered to the saints and handed down to us'—such is their language concerning articles of the Creed; but on prophecy (with the exception, perhaps, of the brief list of subjects above cited from Augustine) they do not speak in the same manner. Interpretations are, in most cases, rather pious opinions than actual *credenda:* some clues to discovery are virtually admitted to have been lost: the wisest and most pious seem occasionally to agree to differ. Nevertheless, a continuous stream of consentient judgments upon one point, as *e.g.*, the ultimate *conversion* of the Jews, and an equally constant silence with respect to another point, as the *national restoration* of the race to Palestine, is a fact of no small importance. If a certain view claim to be of Christian birth, and is in reality Judaic in its origin; if it claim to have been anciently held in the Church and is in reality very recent; if it claim to be founded on the sure warrant of God's word, and is in reality based upon a mistaken system of interpretation; it is at least well that the matter should undergo some sifting and enquiry. Doubtless, a well-known passage in Bishop Butler's 'Analogy,'

[1] We have already mentioned the type of Joseph. Estius speaks of an ecclesiastical one, which, although connected with the Roman ritual, and not with that of our own Church, is too curious to be quite passed by. The priest commencing the office at the right of the altar, yet performs most at the left, and finally returns to the right. This practice Estius regards as a figure of the Gospel, commencing with the Jews, departing for most of the world's ages to the Gentiles, and then, ultimately, returning to the Jews again.

wherein that great philosophic divine speaks of new discoveries yet to be made in the pages of Holy Scripture, may most fitly be applied to the prophetic books of the Old and the New Testament. But then we have a right to see that the seekers be fitly qualified for their most sacred and responsible task. Are they, as a matter of fact, so qualified? Do the disciples of this modern school display such gifts of thought, of learning, of pious and reverent handling of their holy themes, as to command the respectful attention of the Christian Church? Let the utterly ephemeral character of the majority of their productions, let their entire lack of influence beyond the shores of Great Britain, be our reply. We turn to other lands and other men.

Between the sixth and the sixteenth centuries little seems to have been written upon the possibility of a national resuscitation of Israel. No man argues against opinions which are not seriously maintained amongst those whom he respects or thinks worth opposing: no children of the Church then cared, apparently, to confront ideas supposed to be only cherished in the prostrate and defeated synagogue. But in the earlier and later centuries the case stands differently. The more primitive Fathers come across the notion, either (as we have seen) in connexion with the question of the Millennium; or, again, in discourses against the Jews; or, thirdly, in apologies for the faith, wherein they point out to their heathen adversaries the wonderful confirmation of Christianity afforded by the condition of the race of Israel. The later writers touch upon it incidentally, as will be perceived when we come to mention them.

Some, in early ages, as Macarius the Egyptian, appear to speak almost despairingly of Judaism. Such writers[1] we shall not quote; for although none probably, except Cæsarius, have denied the expectation of ultimate conversion, yet their words *might* be considered by some to prove too much, and to point to more than a temporal overthrow. Our present appeal shall only be made to writers whose sentiments cannot possibly be mistaken.

We have named Tertullian as one of the supporters of the Millennium. It appears that he looked forward to spiritual joys only; but it has been seen that, in his treatise against Marcion, he represents his opponent as charging him with a

[1] See the translation of his 'Institutes of Christian Perfection,' by Mr. Granville Penn, b. v. c. 10. (Nisbet, London, A. D. 1828.) 'When they proceeded to such an extremity of wickedness as to feel no reverential awe for the Majesty of the Master himself, they were then, *once and for ever*, cast out and overthrown; and prophecy, priesthood, and worship, were taken away from them, and given to other nations which believed in Him.'—P. 113.

belief, not only that the Jews should, after death, enjoy in Hades refreshment in Abraham's bosom (*post decursum vitæ apud inferos in sinu Abrahæ refrigerium*); but likewise a restitution to their former country and condition (*pristinum statum ex restitutione terræ*). Let us listen to Tertullian's reply:—

'O exceeding goodness of God, if, when appeased, he restoreth that which he hath taken away in his wrath. O thy God, who both slayeth and maketh whole: ordereth evils and createth peace. O mercy of God that extendeth even unto Hades. Of Abraham's bosom we will speak at the proper time. *But concerning the restoration of Judæa (which the Jews also themselves hope for literally, led thereto by the mention of places and countries) how the allegorical interpretation suiteth spiritually to Christ and the Church, its constitution and its fruits*, it were long to trace, and has already been discussed in another work, which we entitle '*De Spe Fidelium.*'"[1]

And he proceeds to contrast with Jewish expectations his own belief in the reign of the thousand years, *after* the resurrection, in Jerusalem our mother above, brought down from heaven —the Jerusalem which Ezekiel knew and S. John beheld.[2] Nothing can be clearer than that Tertullian believed the Jews to have misunderstood the meaning of Holy Scripture, when they gathered from it the prospect of a literal re-possession of Canaan.

From the works of a Millenarian divine we turn to those of that great genius who first impugned, with success, the notion of an *actual* thousand years being the meaning of S. John in the Apocalypse. Let it be remembered, that agreement between those who are in some respects at variance, is always allowed to be a confirmation of the points agreed upon. Thus, in his famous treatise against the infidel Celsus, writes Origen on the theme before us:—

'One of the proofs, of Jesus having been something holy and divine, is the multitude and vastness of the ills that have now, on His account, for a long time befallen the Jews. *And we may confidently assert that they will never be restored.*'[3]

---

[1] 'Deum optimum si reddit placatus quod et abstulerit iratus. O Deum tuum qui et cædit et sanat: condit mala et facit pacem. O Deum etiam ad inferos usque misericordem. Sed de sinu Abrahæ suo tempore. De restitutione verò Judææ, quam et ipsi Judæi, ita ut describitur, sperant, locorum et regionum nominibus inducti, quomodo allegorica interpretatio in Christum et in Ecclesiam, et habitum et fructum ejus spiritaliter competat, et longum est persequi et in alio opere digestum, quod inscribimus "*De Spe Fidelium.*"'—Tertull. cont. Marcionem, l. iii. c. 24, (p. 412, Ed. Wirceburgi, A. D. 1780.)

The '*De spe Fidelium*' is unfortunately lost.

[2] 'Nam et confitemur in terrâ nobis regnum repromissum sed ante cœlum, *sed alio statu, utpote post resurrectionem* in mille annos, in civitate divini operis Jerusalem cœlo delatâ; quam et Apostolus matrem nostram sursum designat. . . Hanc et Ezechiel novit et Apostolus Joannes vidit.'—Tertull. ibid.

[3] ἓν οὖν τῶν παριστάντων θεῖόν τι καὶ ἱερὸν χρῆμα γεγόνεναι τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐστι καὶ τὸ Ἰουδαίους ἐπ' αὐτῷ τοσαῦτα καὶ τοιαῦτα πόλλῳ ἤδη συμβεβήκεναι χρόνῳ. Θαῤῥοῦντες δ' ἐροῦμεν ὅτι οὐδ' ἀποκατασταθήσονται.—Origenes cont. Cels. lib. iv. (tom. i. p. 516. Ed. Ben.)

Such language as this, whether used by Macarius or Origen, is not inconsistent with the hope of Jewish conversion, because such conversion does not involve any restoration of the ancient worship, priesthood, or national *status*. Other writers have shown what they meant by such terms; as, indeed, Origen may be well considered to do in the present instance, for he goes to assign more distinctly the death of the Saviour as the one cause of Jewish calamities, and declares that God's call to blessedness (*τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς τὴν μακαριότητα κλῆσιν*) has been transferred to another nation: 'I mean the Christians, to whom hath come 'the doctrine concerning genuine and pure religion; who have 'received new laws suited to their universal polity (*τῇ πανταχοῦ 'καθεστώσῃ πολιτείᾳ*), since those elder laws (inasmuch as they 'were given to a single nation governed by kings of its own race 'and habits) could not possibly be kept.'

It is, then, against the restoration, not the conversion of Israel, that such arguments were anciently directed. Yet the fear of being supposed to countenance Judaic views by the admission of a hopefulness concerning the end of the nation's life, seems to have caused some writers to speak in a more guarded manner than they would otherwise have done. This was specially the case with S. Jerome. That this great translator and critic of Holy Scripture *believed in the conversion* of the Jews, and *rejected the idea of their national resuscitation*, cannot be doubted by any who will take the trouble to compare the various passages in which he speaks of Jews and Judaism. If on either point S. Jerome appears to speak hesitatingly, such hesitation will be found to arise, on the one hand, from the fear already alluded to, lest he should be claimed as a partisan of Judaic interpretations of prophecy; on the other hand, lest, in opposing Millenarian views, his naturally impetuous temper might hurry him into disrespectful expressions towards the memory of the great and good men who had maintained them. From the list of notices of the subject in the works of Jerome, the following will, we believe, be found to be a perfectly fair, although brief, sample of his mode of treating it:—

'It must be observed, that this adultress (Hosea iii. 1) sets forth the present condition of the Jews, who, though devoid of God and knowledge of the Scriptures, and the grace of the Holy Spirit, are yet beloved of the Lord, *who looketh for the salvation of all men, and openeth the door to the repentant.*'[1]

'And since it were long at present to argue against the Judaic teaching and a blessedness that gratifies the Jewish palate and belly . . . . let it

[1] 'Et notandum quod hæc adultera præsens tempus significet Judæorum, qui absque Deo et notitiâ Scripturarum et gratiâ Spiritûs sancti diligantur à domino, *qui omnium expectat salutem et aperit januam pœnitentibus.*'—S. Hieron. in Osee, c. iii. (tom. vi. p. 15. Ed. Basileæ, A. D. 1524.)

suffice to explain the matter briefly: *let us pass to the spiritual meaning, according to which we have explained also the latter portion of Isaiah.* For we do not, according to those Jewish fables which they call traditions (δευτερώσεις) look for a golden and jewelled Jerusalem from heaven, nor expect again to undergo the penalty of circumcision: nor to offer victims of bulls and rams, nor to sleep on the repose of the Sabbath day.'[1]

This outburst of feeling is followed by much detail, which deserves the attention of those who would thoroughly fathom the question. We can only find room for the following part of the commentary. (The chapter is Ezekiel xxxvii.)

'But if that nation shall not have felt its sinfulness, but shall have polluted His holy name, then shall all, among whom they have dwelt, exclaim: "Behold the people of God, behold the people that departed, yea, rather was cast forth, out of his land." But if they shall have repented, and I have been sanctified in the midst of them: then shall all the multitude of the Gentiles know, that I will take them from the lands whither they had been scattered, *and will bring them back into the land of the Church,* and will sprinkle over them not only the waters of saving baptism, but the waters likewise of doctrine and of the word of God, and I will cleanse them from all their defilements, and from all their idols and errors, which they had wrought within their hearts.'[2]

To students of Oriental tongues we submit the question, whether we may not claim on our side the authority of that sainted and most poetic doctor, S. Ephrem Syrus; whether, in modern times, the great Hebraist, Pocock, does not favour the same cause; whether we may not justly rank among the supporters of our view a name not unworthy to be joined with these—that of the present Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Oxford.[3] But we must not now linger upon debateable territory, and will, therefore, transport ourselves to Constantinople — the Constantinople of the fourth century, before Mahomet was born, or the Czar an European potentate.

---

[1] 'Et quia longum est nunc adversum dogma Judaicum et beatitudinem ventri et gutturi Judaico servientem in brevi explanatione dicere: *ad spiritualem intelligentiam transeamus, juxta quam et Esaiæ extremas partes interpretati sumus.* Neque enim juxta Judaicas fabulas quas illi δευτερώσεις appellant, geminatam et auream de cœlo expectamus Hierusalem, nec rursum passuri circumcisionis injuriam: nec oblaturi taurorum et arietum victimas, nec sabbati otio dormiemus.'

[2] 'Quod si nec senserit peccatum suum sed polluerit nomen sanctum ejus, dicent omnes inter quos habitaverit: Ecce populus Dei, ecce qui egressus est de terrâ ejus, immo projectus. Sin aut egerint pœnitentiam et sanctificatus fuero in medio eorum: tunc omnis gentilium turba cognoscet quod ego eos tollam de terris in quas dispersi erant, *et reducam in terram ecclesiæ,* et effundam super illos nequaquam aquas baptismi salutaris sed aquas doctrinæ et sermonis Dei, et mundabo illos ab universis inquinamentis suis, et ab universis idolis atque erroribus quæ in suo corde simulaverant.'—S. Hieron. in Ezech. cap. xxxvii. (tom. v. p. 509, Ed. Basil.) We submit to scholars that this version of the word *nequaquam,* however unclassical, gives the true meaning of S. Jerome.

[3] S. Ephrem Syrus in Esai. v. sub fin. Pocock on Hosea iii. Dr. Pusey, note to Oxf. Tr. of Tertullian, p. 123.

Let us consider the opinions of S. Chrysostom. That great and eloquent Patriarch did not content himself with the simple expression of his conviction that Jerusalem would never be again restored to her place among the cities of the earth. His auditors had no mere *αὐτὸς ἔφη* to carry away with them; but a long, and, in some respects, even an intricate chain of argument. His reasonings will be found in that *Oratio adversus Judæos*, which the Benedictine editors have placed as *fifth* among the eight with the same title.[1] So great is its length, that the gifted preacher seems to have paid the penalty of, what is now termed, a clerical sore throat. What remedies he may have used, even Benedictine research has failed to discover; but hoarseness did not prevent him from giving his congregation a summary of this discourse on the very next day, which was a solemn one, kept in memory of the Martyrs.[2] Modern criticism has discovered flaws in a few points of these disquisitions. The chronology employed in part of the sixth discourse is now pronounced inaccurate. Grotius (as cited by Spencer, *ad Origen. c. Cels.*) raises strong doubts as to the justice of an appeal made to Josephus, who, in Chrysostom's judgment, despaired of the future national resuscitation of his countrymen. The quotations from the Jewish historian, although just as regards sense, are not given in the words of the writer. And the discussion on the prophecies of Daniel, and the captivity (as S. Chrysostom calls it) under Antiochus, may very possibly lie open to objections. Still, after making all reasonable deductions for these blemishes (which are due probably to the age at least as much as to the writer), there remains a mass of argument which is keen and forcible, and not easily to be gainsayed. We can only give a broken abstract.

In that flowing and copious Greek, which won for him his world-famed title, the archbishop invites the attention of his audience to the triumphs of the Divine Founder of Christianity, considered as a Legislator and a Prophet: —

'Others have tried to introduce dogmas, and to found a new polity, but all have failed. Witness Zeno, Plato, Socrates, Diagoras, Pythagoras, Apollonius of Tyana, and numbers more. (Not that one would compare the true Christ with these, save as a condescension to the weakness of the Jews, who regard him as mere man. Thus S. Paul deigned to argue from the altar at Athens, for the sake of those whom he was addressing.) Look at the failure of Theudas and Judas of Galilee, as set forth by their own Gamaliel. See the obedience paid to the laws of Christ not in one,

[1] The arrangement was a matter of no slight difficulty, and differs considerably from that of Savile and other previous editors.—Ed. Ben. tom. i. p. 583. *et sqq.*

[2] See the heading of the *sixth* discourse, which is about *half* the length of the preceding one. *Βράγχῳ κατασχεθεὶς ἀπὸ τοῦ μήκους τῶν εἰρημένων.* Erasmus elegantly Latinizes: *cùm prolixius disseruisset, atque hinc raucedinem vocis contraxisset, &c.* (Ed. Ben. tom. i. p. 649.)

nor ten, nor twenty homes, but in all parts of the world; an obedience frequently involving the greatest sacrifices, which are cheerfully suffered for His sake. Who, besides, ever availed to effect this? He foretold how that woman's pouring of the ointment should be named wheresoever his Gospel was preached; how his Church should spread; how wars should arise, and the temple be overthrown, the Jews led captive into all nations, and Jerusalem be trodden down of the Gentiles. If all the rest, as we see and know, has come to pass, why should the Jews expect a reversal of this last prediction? Let us turn to their own prophets. Can they show any announcement of a return from *this* captivity? They suffered aforetime a captivity in Egypt. Place, time, persons, limit of duration, were all foretold: God made them partly known even to Abraham (Gen. xv. 13; Cf. xlvi. 2—4, l. 25). They suffered aforetime a captivity in Babylon. But Jeremiah accurately defined it (Jer. xxix. 10), and Daniel understood this "Word of the Lord" (Dan. ix. 2). A third captivity, that under Antiochus Epiphanes, was predicted by Daniel himself, as also the liberation under the Maccabees (Dan. viii. and xi.). But where is the end of their present state of servitude announced? Do not the words of Daniel make against it (Dan. ix. 27; xii. 7, 8, 9)?[1] Does their own weightiest author, Josephus, (who admits that Daniel foretold the overthrow by the Romans,) dare to prophesy a restoration of Jerusalem? A right understanding of the 70 weeks of Daniel would lead men to the negative conclusion.

'If the Jews had never attempted to rebuild their temple, they might urge that they could do it, if it pleased them. But this pretext they have cut away for themselves. They have thrice made the attempt, and thrice been repulsed, as it might be in the Olympic games, so that the Church's crown of victory remains indisputable (*ὥστε ἀναμφισβήτητον εἶναι τῆς ἐκκλησίας τὸν στέφανον*). They tried it under Adrian, and the result was a more thorough overthrow than ever. The city lost her name, and became Ælia, after Ælius Adrianus. They tried it under Constantine, and were chased away; the captives having first lost their ears, and received the brand upon their persons. But this is old and obsolete. Not so; the seniors among them can remember it. But I come to a third attempt, one notorious even to the young; one which happened, not under Adrian nor Constantine, but under a monarch of our generation, some twenty years ago. Julian, of all emperors the most impious—it was to *this* wicked pagan that they did not blush to appeal for the restitution of their temple, their city, and their rites, and to invoke the aid of his impure hands to the construction of *holy* places. They perceived not that they were attempting the impossible; they bethought them not that if *man* had overthrown, *man* might have restored; but that human power could never reverse the divine decree. "For the Lord of Hosts hath purposed, and who shall disannul it? and His hand is stretched out, and who shall turn it back?" Expense and toil were not spared; that mad and senseless one thought to frustrate the sentence of Christ. But He "taketh the wise in their own craftiness." The fire burst forth; even Jews were startled and abashed: even Julian feared to proceed further. Go even now to Jerusalem, and you may see the bare foundations; ask the reason, and you will be told none other than this. We are all witnesses of these things; and they occurred, not under pious emperors, lest any should say the Christians stopped the work, but *then*, when we were persecuted, when our very lives were in danger, when liberty of speech was denied, and heathenism was flourishing. *Then* did all this happen, that no shameless pretext might be

[1] Dan. ix. 27 is thus interpreted by Cornelius à Lapide: 'Jerusalem, cujus desolatio durabit usque in finem mundi.'

left to them.—No: it was not to be. Your prophets foretold the preaching of Christ's gospel, and the coming of another kind of sacrifice. If I quote those before the captivity, you will say that the ills they predicted came to pass *in* the captivity. Listen, then, to the latest, Malachi. He, when all was restored, foretold the abolition of your sacrifices; speaking in the person of the Almighty, he says, "Neither will I accept an offering at your hand. For from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same my name shall be great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering. But ye have profaned it." This universality is fulfilled in Christ alone. The pure sacrifice is the Christian one, offered, not with smoke and savour, blood and trespass-offerings, but through the grace of the Holy Spirit. Hearken how the Gospels and the Apostle agree with prophecy. The Apostle (Titus ii. 11) tells of the saving grace appearing unto all men. Christ informs the Samaritan woman of the worshipping, not on Gerizim nor at Jerusalem, but in spirit and in truth (S. John iv. 21—23). Christians, bring back by every means in your power these sick ones to Christ, that both here and hereafter we may receive a reward, far surpassing our good deeds, by the grace and goodness of our Lord Jesus Christ; through whom and with whom be glory to the Father, together with the holy and life-giving Spirit, now and ever, world without end. Amen.'

Such is a sketch (however feeble and imperfect) of the teaching which this glorious doctor of the Church repeats briefly in the following form:—

'To their present captivity no prophet has defined a limit of time. That these woes will have an end, and be in somewise stayed, neither Daniel nor any other prophet has declared. Nay, he has even predicted the reverse, that this servitude shall hold them unto the consummation.'[1]

A long gulf must now be leapt across. For reasons above stated, we must descend to very recent times. Yet, in passing, we may observe that the general tone of Luther's *exegesis* (so far as we are acquainted with it) appears far more consonant with the patristic interpretations of the words of Psalmist and Prophet than with either the Judaic or the modern (semi-Judaic) view. And as regards Calvin, it may be doubted whether he looked upon Judaism with any feelings of tenderness or of hope. Certainly, in commenting upon Romans xi. 26, he interprets the words 'all Israel' of the spiritual only, and not the lineal, progeny of Abraham. Some few ancient writers, Theodoret[2] for instance, agree with him in this comment; but it is decidedly at variance with the general *consensus*

[1] Τῇ παρούσῃ δὲ [δουλείᾳ sc.] οὐδεὶς ὥρισε χρόνον προφήτης.—ὅτι δὲ ἕξει τέλος καὶ στήσεταί που τὰ κακὰ ταῦτα, οὔτε ἐκεῖνος ἐδήλωσεν, οὔτε ἄλλος τις προφήτης, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὐναντίον προεῖπεν, ὅτι ἕως συντελείας καθέξει αὐτοὺς ἡ δουλεία αὕτη. (S. Chrys. Orat. VI. adv. Jud.—Tom. i. pp. 650,1. Ed. Ben.)

[2] Theodoret, however, looked for Jewish conversion. The present writer has not had the opportunity of examining Calvin's Commentary on Jeremiah and other parts of the *Old* Testament as he could wish; but the great logical consistency of the Genevese Reformer, (admitted even by Möhler and other adverse critics,) induces him to believe Calvin to have taught the same thing throughout.

patrum. If, as we are inclined to believe, Calvin was wholly adverse to any expectations of Jewish resuscitation, whether temporal or spiritual, his great influence would sufficiently account for that tone of Swiss theology to which allusion was made at the commencement of this article.

But our vault over some centuries will let us alight upon a name of European celebrity—no less an one than that of Blaise Pascal. Over and above the respect due to his *dicta* in general, we cannot but think that peculiar attention should be paid to his sentiments respecting the Jews, because Pascal had bestowed so much of his great powers of thought upon the fortunes of that unhappy race. Nowhere, perhaps, in a work of apology for Christianity, is so large a proportion of pages devoted to reflections upon the Jews, as in the famous 'Pensées.' Pascal, too, believed that they would ultimately repent and accept the Gospel; but, as regards a national restoration, how completely he is a disciple of Origen and Chrysostom let the following extract suffice to prove:—

'The condition in which we see the Jews is, moreover, a great proof of Christianity. For it is an astonishing thing to see this people exist for so long a period, and to see it always miserable: it being requisite for the proof of Jesus Christ, both that they should exist to prove His truth, and also that they should be miserable, because they crucified Him; and although prolonged misery and existence are contradictories, they nevertheless continue to exist despite their misery.

'But were they not almost in the same condition at the time of the captivity? *No.* The sceptre was not at all interrupted by the captivity in Babylon, *because the return was promised and foretold.* When Nebuchadnezzar carried off the people, then, for fear lest they should imagine that the sceptre had departed from Judah, it was told them beforehand that they would be there but for a short time, and that they should be re-established. They were constantly consoled by their prophets, and their kings were continued. But the second destruction is without promise of re-establishment, without prophets, without kings, without consolation, without hope, because the sceptre had departed for ever. (*Mais la seconde destruction est sans promesse de rétablissement, sans prophètes, sans rois, sans consolation, sans espérance, parce que le sceptre est ôté pour jamais.*)

'That is hardly captivity which possesses the assurance of being delivered at the end of seventy years. But *now* they are without any hope.'[1]

We must now mention a living writer. Who, among all the present race of German commentators upon Prophecy, would be selected by Englishmen as the most deserving of respect? We need not go to cloistered students for a reply. Even a debater in the British House of Commons can pronounce for us the name of Hengstenberg. Let us open, then, his *Christology of the Old Testament.*

[1] Pensées de Pascal. Seconde Partie. Article xii. § iv.

On Zechariah xi. 12, he speaks of the restoration of Israel to their ancient gracious relation to the Lord, as taught by plain declarations, both of the Old and New Testament. He expresses his conviction (as Mede and others have done) that the declaration of our Lord in S. Matthew xxiii. 39, is thus to be understood.[1] Just before he has observed:—

'In the second part of Isaiah the return from exile is so constantly regarded *as a type of the future return of the heathen nations from the captivity of sin and error*, that it is often difficult to decide what belongs to the type and what to the antitype,—so, also, the splendid deliverance of the people of God from their oppressors, through the Maccabees, typified their future last and great deliverance.'

The above extract will probably seem to mark with sufficient clearness the side espoused by this devout and instructive commentator; but he has elsewhere made remarks which are so valuable, as bearing on the general principles of prophetic interpretation, and so peculiarly applicable to the particular questions before us, that we cannot refrain from alluding to them, and (in part at least) setting them before our readers, many of whom may not have read them previously. Now it has been asserted by Bishop Horsley, that Calvin was a bad commentator upon the Prophets, for the same reason that he would have made a bad commentator upon a profane poet; intimating (what is no doubt true) that the author of the Institutes did not combine with his great logical acumen and power of expression in argument, a corresponding warmth of imagination. It is one of the many merits of Hengstenberg, that he does not forget that the Seer of Israel fulfilled both senses of the word *Vates*. To explain away most solemn truths, as many of Hengstenberg's rationalistic countrymen have done, by representing them as mere poetic ornaments, is indeed most shocking and sinful; but it does not therefore follow that we shall attain the true sense of God's Word, by forgetting that it has pleased Him, who gave it, so largely to employ poetry as the vehicle of His revelations. On a previous verse (the 14th) of this eleventh chapter of Zechariah, Hengstenberg justly says:—

'We have already had occasion often to remark, that in the representation of *future things* the images are borrowed from the *past*. Thus, *e.g.*, in the tenth chapter, the *future* deliverance is described as *a passage through the Red Sea;* so likewise as *a deliverance from the yoke of the Assyrians and Egyptians*, who had long been deprived of their power at the time of Zechariah.—Such passages would not have been so grossly misunderstood, if more regard had been paid to the analogy of poetry in general, and particularly that of Christian hymns. When, *e.g.*, the poet says—

"Deep it is not; on boldly—the Red Sea
By God's command shall make a way for thee!"

who can suppose that he is on the point of passing the Red Sea? or when

[1] Section 610, p. 353, Eng. trans. Ed. Kerchever Arnold.
[2] P. 349, § 604.

it is said, "*Egypt, good night!*" that he has prepared himself for a journey from Egypt to Canaan? Thus also it is here.'[1]

But, above all, would we request the student, who would fain examine these matters for himself, to read with care and thoroughly digest the comment of this distinguished interpreter upon Hosea i. 11.

We can only find space for a portion here. [The italics are not ours, either in this or the preceding quotation.]

'A man may be *in Canaan*, and at the same time *in Babylonia and Assyria*. It is true, indeed, that in the times of the Old Testament the higher possession and the lower stood in a certain connexion. But where the Lord is not, with his gifts and blessings, there *Canaan* cannot be; it was as a land in which the Lord was present, that it was so valuable and dear to all the pious. From what has been said, it also appears, that, in respect to the historical reference, we ought by no means to stop at the times of the Old Testament, and *just as little to dream of a still future return of Israel to Canaan*. Luther's explanation—"*They shall ascend to a heavenly country from this land of their sojourning*," is perfectly just, not indeed as to the letter, but as to the reality. It is not the *form* of the Divine inheritance, but the *substance*, which the prophet has in view. Under the New Testament, where the whole earth has become a Canaan, the form is changed, the *substance* remains. Under the new covenant, *Canaan must, even in the north, joyfully bloom for the beloved*. The three stations, *Egypt*, the *wilderness*, and *Canaan*, for ever remain; but we go from one to another, only with the feet of the spirit, not, as under the old covenant, at the same time with the feet of the body. The fulfilment of the prophecy is therefore progressive, and will not terminate until the whole of God's saving plan is completed. It commenced at Babylon, was carried forward at the appearance of Christ whom many out of Judah and Israel placed at their head as the common leader to Canaan; it is still daily realized in our sight in every Israelite who follows their example; it will hereafter reach the final fulfilment in the last and greatest proof of the covenant faithfulness of God towards Israel, which, happily, is just as much secured by the New Testament as by the Old.'[2]

Just and admirable as these remarks appear to us, and gladly as we number Hengstenberg among our allies, yet so far as respects the thoughts themselves, perhaps we need hardly have gone to Germany to seek them. Had they not, in great part, been almost literally anticipated by our poet of the Christian Year?

'He is come down to break their chain;
Though never more on Sion's fane
His *visible* ensign wave;
'*Tis Sion*, wheresoe'er *they* dwell,
Who, *with his own true Israel*,
Shall own Him strong to save.

He shall redeem them, one by one,
Where'er the world-encircling sun
Shall see them meekly kneel;
All that He asks on Israel's part,
Is only, that the captive heart
Its woe and burthen feel.'

[1] P. 349, § 604. [2] Pp. 489, 490, § 793.

If we have been fortunate enough to secure a reader who has waded through the prolix repetitions which our course of inquiry has, almost unavoidably, entailed on us, such an one will find no great difficulty in the application of the principles laid down to the particular passages of Holy Scripture, which are commonly appealed to in the present controversy. It may be well, however, to say a few words upon some of these portions of the prophetic writings.

One of the most obvious *primâ facie* passages consists of that long description of a rebuilt temple, which occupies the last nine chapters of Ezekiel. It is true that even a literal interpretation of Ezekiel's vision would not establish the point of a Jewish national restoration; nevertheless it will be found to repay a moment's examination. We say a moment's, for surely even the hastiest *second* glance must go far to suggest such thoughts as occurred to our countryman Thomas Fuller:—

'As our Saviour once told Pilate, "My kingdom is not of this world," so the sense of Ezekiel's land, city, and temple, is not carnal and corporeal, but mystical and spiritual. Yea, God may seem of purpose to have troubled and perplexed the text, embittering the nibbles thereof with inextricable difficulties merely to wean us from the milk of the letter, and make us with more appetite seek for stronger meat therein. For the main, therefore, it is generally conceived, this vision imports the great enlargement and dilatation of the Church under the Gospel, when the Gentiles shall be called to the knowledge of Christ and the Jews also, (as mainly concerned, though not solely intended in this vision,) brought home to their true Messiah, not excluding even those of the ten tribes from having each his portion in the performance of this prophecy.'[1]

This comment of Fuller coincides with the judgments of S. Jerome and S. Gregory; nay more, even some of the Jewish Rabbins were compelled to admit that the descriptions here referred to must be figuratively, not literally, interpreted.[2] The same may be almost repeated concerning the corresponding chapters in the Apocalypse, which are spiritually understood by the great majority even of those who are opposed to us on the questions here at issue.[3]

Yet let it be well weighed how much is involved in this admission. If there *be* a prophecy, of which men have no right to expect a literal fulfilment, why should that particular prophecy be conceived to stand alone in this respect? Other predictions will be found, we believe, to present, on the literal hypothesis, difficulties as insuperable as those of the vision of Ezekiel.

---

[1] A Pisgah-sight of Palestine, by Thomas Fuller, B.D. (Lond. A.D. 1650.)

[2] Corn. à Lap. in Ezech. xl. Synopsis Capitis.

[3] Mede, Bp. Newton, and others. We are sorry to have Dr. Todd against us: but much as we value his services, and agree with his *negative* conclusions, we are unable to follow him, in what seems to us an *undue* amount of futurism and adherence to literal interpretations.

Great stress is laid, and not unnaturally, by our opponents, upon those texts which speak of a future union of Ephraim with Judah; such as Jeremiah l. 4, 5; and Ezekiel xxxvii. 15—19. One famous commentator, Cornelius à Lapide, thinks that such passages have already received a literal fulfilment, inasmuch as Cyrus and Artaxerxes gave permission to the *ten* tribes, as well as the *two*, to return to Palestine; a permission, he says, of which Josephus intimates that many Israelites availed themselves.[1] Such a solution we would gladly adopt; but it is not, we fear, borne out by the facts of the case. We cannot see in Josephus such an intimation as à Lapide attributes to him, and are therefore content (with S. Austin and with Hengstenberg) to look only for that spiritual completion made by the union of Jew and Gentile in Christ our Lord, already commenced (Ephes. ii. 11—22), and to be perfected more fully hereafter. Why should this promise be literally fulfilled any more than those made to the sons of Levi or to David?

The return, again, is promised in this same chapter of Ezekiel (xxxvii. 24, 25). Most true, but it is connected with the renewed reign of David as their prince. Now as none, not even the Jews, believe in a return of the son of Jesse, with what consistency can we understand one half of this promise according to the letter, and the remainder spiritually?

The promises, with which Amos closes his prophecy, are also largely dwelt upon. Certainly they are, at first sight, perhaps the strongest that can be urged in favour of a re-establishment of Israel in Palestine. But, then, is not this the very passage which is always held to have been referred to by the first Bishop of Jerusalem, S. James the Less, in the earliest Council of Christ's Church? Let us look at his inspired commentary. 'And to this agree (*συμφωνοῦσιν*) the words of the prophets, 'as it is written, After this I will return, and will build 'again the tabernacle of David which is fallen down; and I 'will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up. *That* '*the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles,* '*upon whom my name is called,* saith the Lord, who doeth all 'these things.' (Acts xv. 15—17.) If S. James applies the prophecy of Amos to illustrate S. Peter's declaration 'how God 'at the first did visit the Gentiles, to take out of them a people 'for His name,' (Ib. ver. 14,) does he not thereby almost exclude the idea of a subsequent fulfilment after the letter; does he not lend a most weighty and important sanction to our interpretation of the similar passages in Jeremiah and Ezekiel, and, through these, to the general principles maintained throughout the process of our argument?

[1] Corn. à Lap. in Jer. l. 4.

One more passage, and one only, shall be considered by us. In the eleventh chapter of Isaiah, we read as follows:—'And 'it shall come to pass in that day, *that* the Lord shall set His 'hand again the second time to recover the remnant of his 'people which shall be left, from Assyria, and from Egypt, and 'from Pathros, and from Cush, and from Elam, and from 'Shinar, and from Hamath, and from the islands of the sea. 'And He shall set up an ensign for the nations, and shall 'assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dis-'persed of Judah from the four corners of the earth. The envy 'also of Ephraim shall depart, and the adversaries of Judah 'shall be cut off: Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah 'shall not vex Ephraim.'

The well-known *dictum* of Bishop Butler, that, in cases of conscience, *first* impressions are the most trustworthy, cannot be extended to matters involving critical study and argumentative research. Upon the verses before us, the student who is not confident of the justice of his own first hasty conclusions, may enjoy the advantage of comparing the criticisms of three commentators of different communions—Bishop Lowth, Cornelius à Lapide, and Campegius Vitringa. They are no mean judges, no unfavourable representatives of their respective Churches. Lowth's lectures upon Hebrew Sacred Poetry have been most honourably re-edited in Germany; the Jesuit, à Lapide, has won (as Dr. Charles Maitland truly remarks), by his learning and judgment, the respect of the learned of all communions; the Dutch commentator, Vitringa, if in controversy wildly ultra-Protestant, is in other respects not only sane and practical, but exhibits that union of reasoning power with fervour of imagination, which men justly denominate genius. All three were endowed with gifts of heart as well as of head, and treat their hallowed subjects with reverent thoughtfulness of spirit.

Now, upon the text before us, *all three are perfectly agreed.* All three maintain that, whatever degree of literal fulfilment may have been already granted to this prophecy, none other than spiritual fulfilment can henceforth be looked for by the Church.

The English bishop states his conviction briefly, without entering into much detail. A Lapide is more copious: he recounts, according to his custom, the different opinions of illustrious critics with respect to 'the second time' alluded to by the Prophet, which naturally involve some contrariety of sentiments respecting the *first* time. His own judgment inclines towards regarding the deliverance from Egypt through Moses as the *first,* from the world, and sin, and Satan, through Christ as the *second* deliverance. This latter 'recovery of the

remnant' is, of course, in perpetual progress, and awaits its complete consummation at the judgment of the last great day. Special attention, however, is called to the manner in which the Apostles were permitted to gather 'Jews, devout men out of every nation under heaven,' into the fold of Christ upon the wonderful day of Pentecost.

Far more lengthy and elaborate are the masterly comments of Vitringa; and the student, whether convinced by them or not, can hardly fail to profit greatly by an inspection of them. He dwells, even more strongly than à Lapide, upon the very large fulfilment of the promises here uttered by Isaiah, which was granted in the events of the first Whit-Sunday; a view, we may observe, which seems sanctioned by the English Church, in that she has appointed this chapter to be read as a Lesson in the service for that high festival. If Vitringa be at times (as we must think) disposed to reject too hastily evangelic interpretations, to shrink too much from what is supernatural, to regard too lightly the *consensus* of Fathers and the judgments of the early and undivided Church, then of all the more authority is his decision when uninfluenced by the bias of such tendencies.

In the present instance, he proceeds to contrast the conclusions he has formed with the Judaic interpretation of these glorious promises. 'But we do not hold,' our opponents will say, 'that Judaic view reprehended by Vitringa.' No, indeed, they do not hold it in all that completeness and consistency with which Rabbins have long maintained it. They do not expect Messias as an earthly conqueror: they do not (excepting, perhaps, a few of the Irvingite persuasion) expect a restoration of Jewish rites and Jewish sacrifices, either as typical or commemorative of the One adorable offering. But let them look well to it, whether a theory of Judaic origin can cease to be Judaic in its essence by the elimination of a few of its grossest elements. Let them consider whether Vitringa would have allowed them the benefit of this plea. Let them think whether they could possibly have escaped from the scourge of his indignant eloquence:—

'Finally (that I may close this unavoidable digression), I would have the exposition of this prophecy which I have delivered, and which is suited to the conditions of the true reign of Christ, compared with that of the Jews, (a literal and carnal one, which they set forth in accordance with *their* conditions,) that its merit be estimated on good grounds. What do those unhappy ones here see? what do they here seek? Forsooth, that they will some day have a Messiah, who will redeem and collect them from among the Gentiles, amongst whom they are hitherto dispersed; who, overcoming their enemies that would fain thwart this design, will bring back his fellow-tribesmen into Canaan; there again erect a kingdom after the fashion of David and Solomon when most prosperous; restore the

Temple and the carnal Levitical worship, and, fixing his seat at Jerusalem, fiercely assault their enemies the Philistines (only they are no longer in existence) towards the West, and the Arabs on the East, and *thus* reap glory for Himself and for his people. How noble, how great, how magnificent is all this! *Yea, rather, how empty, poor and null! Rather, how unworthy of a Divine King, the Perfect, the Peacemaker, the Teacher and the Saviour alike of Gentile and of Jew!* What shall it profit these wretched ones to enjoy such blessings—blessings of a nature that must either prove poor and of slight account, or else only procurable with grievous damage to the recipients? What shall it profit them again to occupy and inhabit Canaan, at present deserted, which few would wish to inhabit, and thither, at great inconvenience, to transfer their homes? Of what avail for them, when the world is waxing old, to renew an ancient carnal worship, long since obsolete, from which the majority of Gentiles through the wide earth now refrain, and *without* which they themselves trust that they can still be saved? Of what use to wage war with the nations, to inflict and to receive blows, and, under the leadership of the Messiah, to rage against their adversaries with prodigious slaughter? *I ask, further, whether Canaan could contain all the dispersed, and what will be the loss suffered by those who shall be deprived of this privilege?* I say, then, that they are blind hearts and vilest slaves of sense, who feed themselves on such an hope, which, if they should attain it most completely, would make them not one whit more happy and more blessed. *There is one real Redemption, spiritual, Divine*, which *does* make the redeemed blessed, whose effects *are* life-giving: and he who comprehends that the Prophets spake of *this*, *he* attains their true meaning.'—*Vitringa in Jesaiam*, xi. 11, § vii. (tom. i. p. 457, Ed. Herbornæ, A.D. 1715).

And with this noble piece of writing, though weakened by translation from the vigorous Latin of its author, we might well conclude our case, and leave it to the reader's judgment. We must not, indeed, venture, after all, to *dogmatise* upon the subject of unfulfilled prophecy. Jerusalem on earth *may* yet be intended to become the scene of awful and striking events; it may be the first seat of Antichrist, or the spot where the true Messias shall manifest Himself once more. All that we *do* maintain is, that the temporal restoration of the Jewish race, is, to say the least, a highly improbable event; and many, we believe, who have been content to adopt the theory upon trust, will own the strength and variety of the objections which even the slightest examination must disclose. If there be any force in the considerations we have ventured to put forth; if the long silence of ages prove anything at all in the way of negative evidence; if the judgment of such men as Tertullian and Origen, S. Jerome and S. Chrysostom, Pascal, Hengstenberg, and Vitringa, (each singly powerful, how much more so when combined,) can exercise any lawful influence over the minds of those who reverence authority; if the arguments of these great writers, considered by themselves, apart from authorship, be neither light nor trivial; if, lastly, the opposite view be Judaic in its origin, of late date in the Church, unsupported by many interpreters of name, based on a most question-

able system of *exegesis*, and but too often blended with unsound and degrading applications of Holy Scripture; then surely men should pause ere they hastily adopt that view.

So abundant, indeed, is the divine blessing upon all sincerity, that it can hardly be doubted but that much good may have been permitted to arise even from expectations which we must believe to rest upon a sadly weak foundation. Many of the excellent persons, who hold the opinions we have been engaged in controverting, have been led, by the interest thus awakened, to do more for the conversion of the Jews in Europe, as likewise in the East. And it may be that some of us, who are unable to admit the territorial theory, have allowed ourselves to be too much repulsed by the insincerity of some Jewish converts, and the avarice and meanness of the unconverted; and have thus come to disregard that hapless people in our thoughts and alms-giving and prayers, and to forget their claims as the earthly descendants of our great spiritual forefathers. We are not, therefore, to rush into the opposite extreme: we must not dare to palliate the greatness of that crime which is the cause of all their sufferings, nor argue (as has once been done of late) that if the Sacrifice was so infinitely holy, those who brought it about could not be so *very* guilty. This sophism was long since anticipated by Aquinas;[1] and he suggests the just, and indeed almost obvious, reply, that actions are as their motives; and that, consequently, the offering which was made, on the part of the Eternal Son, from the most perfect love and obedience to the Father, and the sublimest compassion for the souls of men, bore an entirely different aspect from the same deed, when regarded as the work of the Jewish people, who caused it to be done under the influence of envy, malice, and unbelief. But as concerning human nature itself, so too with respect to Judaism, there seems to be a twofold view, of which neither side may be lost sight of with impunity. Of this our human nature we are taught to believe that, though miserably fallen through the sin of the *first* Adam, it is yet capable of marvellous restoration to righteousness, even here on earth, through the grace of the Holy Spirit, won for it by the *second* Adam. The world does not really admit the truth of either phase of such a doctrine. Its thorough votaries begin by denying the depth of man's corruption, and end with disbelief in the very existence of human goodness and human sanctity. Somewhat similarly, perhaps, must we beware of overlooking either side of truth as concerns the race of Israel. The long series of rejections of God's messengers, which culminated in the casting out and slaying the Heir of the inheritance Himself; the thwartings and persecutions

[1] Summa Theologiæ. Pars tertia.

exercised by Jews against the infant Church; the sanguinary feuds among themselves, which darkened the last days of their retention of Jerusalem; the covetousness, extortions, hypocrisy, which have disgraced their name in all lands; their reception of numberless false Messiahs, as, for instance, Barchochĕbas in the second, and Sabbathai Sevi in the seventeenth century; these are *facts* which must not be overlooked, for assuredly their record is on high. But as little should we wish to blot out the *remembrance* of what the Jews *have been*, or the *hope* of what they *may be*. They *have been* the appointed channel of God's mercy to mankind at large: the recipients of His oracles; His adopted sons, bound to Him by special covenant; subjects of His law; a light amid the darkness of Heathendom; maintainers of the true worship; heirs of the promises; the children of the Patriarchs, the kinsmen of the Prophets, the fathers of the Apostles and first Martyrs; the brethren, according to the flesh, of the One true and perfect Man, who is the Saviour of the world, Christ Jesus the Lord, from heaven, the Eternal Son, the Second Person of the ever-blessed and undivided Trinity. They *may be*, ere the world's last sun has set, the most devoted of all the worshippers of Christ.

Both aspects are patent upon the face of Holy Scripture. Prophets alternately bless and denounce: Jerusalem is as Sodom, and yet 'the holy City;' the Redeemer Himself weeps over it, and concludes with a tender lament, the most tremendous outburst of righteous indignation, which He, the meek and merciful, was ever known to utter upon earth.[1] S. Paul, in continual sorrow for his brethren, praying that they might be saved, recounting all their glories in the past, wishing himself *anathema* for their sakes,[2] is yet *compelled* to turn from them to the Gentile world,[3] and to leave it on record that in his day 'they please not God and are contrary to all men: forbidding us 'to speak to the Gentiles that they might be saved, to fill up 'their sins alway: for the wrath is come upon them to the utter-'most.'[4] And yet it is this same Apostle who promises that, for all this, they *may be*—nay surely *shall* be—again in the latter days, believing, repentant, pardoned, and accepted of God. It is the recognition of this duplex character of Judaism which gives life and meaning to that affecting poem in the *Christian Year*, from which we have already borrowed:[5] it is this which lends force to that fine comparison of the earthly Israel to the 'Œdipus Coloneus' of Sophocles, which many will remember in the pages of the *Lyra Apostolica*:—

---

[1] S. Matt. xxiii. [2] Romans ix. 2, x. 1. ix. 4, 5, 3.
[3] Acts xiii. 46. xviii. 6. xxviii. 28. [4] 1 Thess. ii. 15, 16.
[5] The Burning Bush. Fifth Sunday in Lent.

'O piteous race!
Fearful to look upon,
Once standing in high place,
Heaven's eldest son.
O aged blind,
Unvenerable! as thou flittest by,
I liken thee to him in pagan song,
In thy gaunt majesty,
The vagrant king, of haughty-purposed mind,
Whom prayer nor plague could bend;
Wrong'd, at the cost of him who did the wrong,
Accurs'd himself, but in his cursing strong,
And honour'd in his end.'

We have said that even mistaken notions, as we deem them, may have been mixed with truth, and converted to good ends. But it does not thence follow that any systematic misinterpretation of God's Word can be otherwise than a great and serious evil. If, among the expectants of a temporal restoration of Israel and return to Canaan, there are *some* who are sober and cautious students of Holy Writ, with the majority the idea but too often includes there most wild and unworthy notions, interpretations of Scripture quite derogatory to the dignity of God's Word, which is thereby connected with events of the most trivial, circumscribed, and ephemeral nature. But too often do the supporters of such views betray the presence of a Judaic element in their creed, which is one of the most marked and painful characteristics of their entire school of theology.[1] But too often does there appear to be a lack of appreciation of the wonderful blessings which (despite all the miserable infirmities and short-comings of individuals and communities) Christianity has wrought for mankind; the evil state of classic Paganism, Buddhism, and Bramanism is disregarded, and the greatness and glory of Christ's Church remains unrecognised. But to dwell upon the Church's greatness leads, it will be urged, to placing the Church in the first place in men's hearts, and its Divine founder in the second. Doubtless such an error may exist, and it is a sad and miserable one. But so may similar ills arise from the proclamation of any Divine truth. Reverence for God's Word—homage and love to the Only-begotten Son—what verities can be more sacred? Yet teaching the one has been known to lead to a most injurious Bibliolatry; to a regard for the letter, and a loss of its spirit: and gratitude to the Saviour has been at times permitted to engender the pernicious heresy, which would regard the Second Person of the Holy Trinity as mild and merciful, and the First Person as only

[1] See Mr. Samuel Lucas's able Essay on '*History as a condition of Progress.*'—(Murray.) We might quote too the Edinburgh reviewer on *Church Parties;* but we mislike such allies;—*Danaos et dona ferentes.*

wrathful and severe—as if there could be a divided will in the Unity of the Divine Majesty. Shall we, therefore, cease to make known these solemn truths? Μὴ γένοιτο. In sooth, there is hardly any idea intellectually more feeble, or morally and religiously more mischievous, than that which would represent a thorough and hearty belief in *one* article of the Creed as incompatible with sound acceptance of *another*. It is the very groundwork of all heresy and misbelief. Do not honour the Son, said the Arian; you detract from the glory of the Father. Do not preach a Trinity, says the Mahometan; you interfere with the sublime truth of the Unity, &c., &c., &c. There is no end to objections of this kind. Yet few can be more utterly unscriptural than the charge of dishonour being done to the Lord of lords, by a proclamation of the claims of His Bride, the Church of God. It is in the Psalms, the Prayer-book of Christians for all time, that we are told not only of the true David, but likewise of the true Jerusalem. It is the Evangelic Prophet (*Evangelista potiùs quàm propheta*, as he has been truly termed) who foretells the Man of sorrows, yet also expatiates on the splendours of that kingdom which even upon earth is full of the divinest grandeur, though its glories be invisible to carnal eyes, its melodies unheard of unpurged ears. It is the Apostle born out of due time, to whom Jesus appeared on the road to Damascus, who speaks not only of Him who was long-suffering, but likewise of that spiritual union betwixt Christ and His Church, which was symbolised by the matrimony of our first parents, while yet in Paradise. It is the loved disciple 'which leaned on His breast at supper,' who was cheered in his lonely exile not only by the sight of the glorified 'Son of man,' but also by the vision of the New Jerusalem, the Lamb's Wife, the Bride adorned for her husband. Oh! if many of those whom we love and honour, and would fain imitate in goodness, would but lay these things to heart, they would surely drop the notion of earthly, local, territorial, theories, and look rather for the fulfilment of prophecy in Christ's Church, as she is, and far more as she shall one day be.

But at least we have here one ground of union. The Churches at large, despite their terrible and mournful schisms, can join *with heartfelt hope* in *one* prayer, beyond those based upon the Creeds which are the common heritage of Christendom. We may all sue for mercy on God's ancient people, and pray that God 'would fetch them home to His flock, that they may be 'saved among the remnant of the true Israelites, and be made 'one fold under one Shepherd, Jesus Christ, our Lord.' *Ita fiat, O Domine! fiat voluntas tua!*

ART. V.—*Voltaire and his Times. By* L. F. BUNGENER. Authorized translation. Edinburgh: Thomas Constable & Co. 1854.

CUSTOM, fashion, and the habits of an age, are at all times interesting and curious subjects of inquiry. Mankind are swayed to and fro, by mysterious unseen influences, to approve at one time what at another they most condemn; to run mad after a fancy of the moment, which is afterwards forgotten or despised. Popular delusions are a study of themselves, and have their history wherewith to accuse the human race of never-ending waves of folly. The delusion of table-turning has within a few weeks been thought worthy of public refutation on scientific principles, as part of a distinguished course of lectures delivered at the Royal Institution, before royalty itself. But fashion has its sway unchecked in very many departments of human life; and can defy all science, all discretion, and even all religion. Where it effects those things only that are legitimate objects of variety, it is useful and refreshing. Much *ennui* is avoided in a large class of our fellow-subjects by the difference of angle subtended in the position of a bonnet. The eye is quickened, and the mind kept alive, by many of the innocent novelties that succeed each other in the stream of life. The great ocean itself is not stagnant, but presents an ever-changing face—an example followed by all Nature, if studied with an observant eye. The objects, however, effected by this power of fashion are not always such as admit of variety without serious consequences to the deepest interest of our being. The consideration of this fickle influence assumes a very different aspect when we see that a blind obedience to her has led a whole generation into the denial of all religion, and to professed infidelity.

In France, during the eighteenth century, it was the fashion to be an infidel; it was the mark of an inquiring mind, the symbol of intelligence. A strong religious conviction, such as at all times is a rare quality, was then necessary in order to avoid what now seems the extremity of wickedness, and almost insanity. Men in these days, who take their ideas from the habits of the age—and are, in accordance with them, induced to present a respectable exterior, and even talk of religion with some degree of solemnity and approval—would, very many of them, have been professed infidels, if their lot had been cast in France of the last century, and they had possessed no greater earnestness than now serves their purpose, and allows them to remain respect-

able. We are not indeed to suppose that the mass of a nation are really no better for a general respect to religion, and for Christianity being, as it were, the fashion. We are bound, of course, to see the greatest advantage in the prevalence of truth over error; but very little discernment of human motives is necessary to convince our plain understanding, that in comparing the religion of one age with another, we must take into calculation on the one side a large number of individuals whose profession of the Christian faith is materially influenced by fashion, and who, under other circumstances, would hold very different language.

The book now before us is an irregular and informal history of this period of infidelity in France; and of all the works of its author which we have read, it is the most interesting and the most full of genuine information and anecdote. True and useful sentiments are also interspersed here and there, which show considerable thought and clearness of mind in the analysis both of individual motives and of general political principles. The style of M. Bungener is always somewhat rambling, and his progress is often through mazes and jungles, in which the reader needs quick attention if he would not be lost; but with patience, either on the one hand to follow the argument, or on the other to endure a temporary cessation of interest, he is always rewarded before long by some interesting touches of sentiment or description, some facts or pictures.

Voltaire is made the centre and spirit of this infidel school. Its gradual approach is described, its influences on social life, on the drama, on art, and on politics, are traced; the want of truthfulness and morality encouraged by it is exposed, and the hypocrisy of some of its main professions successfully laid open.

The history of this period has been often written, but M. Bungener very truly observes that a useful history of such times, and of such men, should be written with reference to their bearing on the existing state of society. M. Villemain's history he considers now obsolete.

'More than one friend has asked me, sometimes in serious alarm about me, sometimes perhaps with an approach to a sneer, whether then I proposed to retouch Villemain. My answer then, as it is now, was that M. Villemain has had few more constant or sincere admirers than I; but would he himself, I added, had he the same things to treat now, treat them as he did then? Twenty years have almost doubled the distance that parted us from the last century, when he finished his review of it. Twenty years,—it is more than Tacitus called *grande mortalis ævi spatium*. Twenty years,—it is much at any epoch, and, in our days, seems almost an age.'—*Voltaire and his Times*, pp. iii. iv.

This now antique line is thus described:—

'That line lay in an odd enough middle course between the old scepticism, which was decidedly in disgrace as frigid and in bad taste, and Christianity, which had come back, but with the accompaniment of Jesuits and confession-tickets. He behoved neither to attack it, for that would have been taken ill as a mere reproduction of Voltaire, nor to defend it, at least directly, for the public would have cried out that he was a Jesuit. He had to respect both his enemies and himself, both the *Encyclopédie* and the Gospel, both the Monarchy and the Revolution; he had to erect a temple in which both Voltaire and *the wretch* should have their thrones.'—Pp. iv. v.

M. Bungener would be more severe towards the eighteenth century. It was an age of harsh judgment on others, and it therefore deserved no indulgence towards itself. His severity, however, is a witness to the power of its leading men.

'Yet it is not without a certain fearfulness that we approach it. It had such an overweening confidence in itself. It looked with such a lofty and distant air on whoever dared to seem to criticise it. Like one of those dead corpses which, although dead, still keep you at a distance, and which you find it difficult to figure to yourself motionless, powerless, the prey of worms: your imagination resuscitates them; you seem to hear their voice, and quail before them as they eye you.

'More than once has this feeling come over me as I worked at this book. I seemed to wander in an immense cemetery peopled with the dead of yesterday, whose wraiths prowled about their graves, themselves invisible, but seeing me, following me. I felt as if some restless eye looked over my shoulder to read the line I had scrolled; I could almost have feared, on looking round, to find myself confronted with the men I had been dissecting. Yes, in the course of my long watchings, at the hour when the expiring lamp flickers in its socket, and when fatigue is fever, more than once I seemed to hear, at my very ear, the grinning laugh which Ferney sent abroad to all the echoes of Europe. The man who for sixty years had laughed at everything and everybody, I could not but fancy laughing still, and laughing too a little at myself.'—Pp. vii. viii.

The genius of Voltaire is not described by M. Bungener as leading the mind of his age, but rather as anticipating it. He is not one of those who 'lays hold of all the vital forces of society, and gathers them into his hand;' he is rather consecrated to the tastes of the multitude. Voltaire, indeed, seems to have been the spokesman of many secret and undeveloped sentiments that were already smouldering in men's minds. He does not fill people's minds with powerful inspirations, but by his satire and his philosophy he compels all around him to a certain consistency of evil. He exposes both real and apparent fallacies; and, commencing by a keen and well-aimed attack on the practical inconsistency of Christians, he proceeds to drag those whom he has got hold of into a denial of the whole principle of Christian faith. He thus acquired an astonishing hatred of Christianity, which pursued him in whatever he did, and which was the more intense and the more wonderful from the absence of any personal feeling of dislike towards eminent individual Christians, or from any natural moroseness of temper. Infidelity, as we can occasion-

ally witness it, is generally the result of a misanthropic gloomy mind, which has fed itself on ill tempers till it ends in a kind of impious rebellion against heavenly as well as earthly powers. Voltaire, however, was not a man of bad temper or of sullen passions. He was fond of society; he had the means of enjoying it; and no man ever passed through a long life with more freedom from care, with more of his own way, or with more apparent comfort, than Voltaire. He was prudence itself in forestalling the means of passing through any temporary persecution which his writings might draw down upon him. He bought an estate which was partly in France, partly in Switzerland, and partly in the Genevese territory. He was thus prepared, like a prize-fighter, to cross the boundary and escape pursuit. He possessed a large fortune in transferable securities belonging to all manner of places and countries; and then he indulged in a peaceful retirement, surrounded by cheerful and flattering guests, and engaged in correspondence with all the great people of Europe.

Voltaire and Rousseau are names which ever go together as the great bugbears of quiet, respectable citizens, and the dread of all who fear sceptics. They form the link between the apparent prosperity of Church and State in the age of Louis XIV. and the downfall of both in the Revolution. They were engaged for many years in preparing the country for that final crash, which was at one time supposed to terminate the history of France. But France has great vitality, and for this reason—that her recorded history as a nation has always been too much comprised in the history of a class. At one time the aristocracy was France, and when it fell France seemed to fall with it; but after this apparent destruction, it was found that others soon occupied the vacant places; and, in fact, that the rest of the nation are a perpetual reserve, from which the ranks of the dominant class can be supplied when a catastrophe takes place. The Parisians have since then been France, as regards history. But this historical France we have seen convulsed as if the country itself was at an end, when it has soon after appeared that the sufferers were but a fraction whose place was at once supplied; the *part* we had looked on too much as the *whole*. The same mistake is made by those who consider that Voltaire and his school were bringing all France to destruction by their writings, and were calling down a curse on the whole people. It is a more true view of the case to identify both the men and their principles with that class only which was the dominant, and at the same time the sinning class, in France. The aristocracy had
luxurious and oppressive; they had become wholl
and religion was almost extinct. It was time, the

day should end, and so it was ordained to be; but the instruments that paved the way for it were not the spontaneous vengeance of the populace, or the rising of the oppressed; they were men whose whole aim was to influence themselves, who, with a diabolical craft and artfulness, dragged them down step by step from bad to worse, till all their sin and unbelief was unmasked, and they stood in open day an accursed race, enemies to God and man, at the mercy of the first wave of popular excitement that should rise up. France herself was never infidel; the faith of Christ has always dwelt securely among the peasants, and in the provinces generally." Voltaire was so true an aristocrat that he did not think the vulgar worth converting to infidelity. He rather wished Christianity to continue their religion, in order to keep both it and them in the greater contempt. The comparison between Voltaire and Rousseau helps to illustrate the intensity of the former in his cause. His hatred of Christianity was even the opportunity for an agreeable absence of egotism in the writer.

'Here, perhaps, there is a fresh paradox; but it strikes me that Voltaire, with his levity of tone and his never-ending sarcasms, was the more serious man of the age than his grave and sententious rival. All his sayings, for him, hit the mark; all his shafts pierced to the quick. The work of the age was his: none more entirely devoted to it. He does not say so, but people know it, and nobody in Europe doubts it; while what Rousseau seeks, above all things, is Rousseau. Voltaire liberally put his glory at the service of the cause; Rousseau always let it be seen, in serving it, that he ever thought more of himself than it, and that, in reality, he cared little about its triumph. Voltaire asked not for martyrdom, but for victory; Rousseau wanted only the struggle, and in it sought only for the name of martyr. "He would be delighted to be hanged," said Voltaire, "provided his name were in the sentence."'—P. xiii.

Of Voltaire it is said that he thought men naturally bad, and dealt gently with them; and of Rousseau that he thought them naturally good, but spoilt by civilisation. The one looked on civilisation as a remedy, the other as a poison.

'In their whole character and movements, we see the same diversity, the same contrasts. The one does his best to add to the influence of talents that of position and riches; the other glories in being nothing, and in having nothing. Voltaire speaks of "my château," and is none the prouder at bottom; Rousseau complains of the high price of bread, and you can see pride peeping through the holes in his mantle. They both spend their lives in complaints—the poor man of his voluntary poverty, the rich one of his failing health, still endurable after living eighty years. But Voltaire passes jests on his maladies, even when real; Rousseau would fain that the whole human race should weep with him over his, even when imaginary. Often, moreover, they both make themselves ridiculous—the one by his seriousness about trifles, the other by his levity on the gravest subjects. But the latter, with his inexhaustible malice, is sometimes kindly; the former, with his universal philanthropy, has always some gall his ink, and sometimes a great deal.'—Pp. xvii. xviii.

The views which animated these two men in their hatred of Christianity were different in their origin, but their result was the same. Voltaire promised happiness on its destruction, whereas the other had no special hatred for it, except as being part of civilisation. He would have men wild and solitary, like beasts of the field, whereas Voltaire preferred wealth and literary society. Both, however, agreed in the sentiment which prompted the perseverance in infidelity, described as follows:—

'What a guard, accordingly, was kept around the dying agony of any one who had once become a liege member of the destructive party! What alarm was felt lest there should escape from him a word, a sign, that might suggest a scruple to the survivors! What haste shown to overwhelm with calumny or ridicule any one who might have wished to inspire the dying man with a little repentance for his past life—a little faith in that future whither death was about to hurry his soul!'—P. xxi.

How great must have been the change in the literary world of France, which presents to us Voltaire in the eighteenth century, in contrast with the writers of France in the seventeenth century! That was an age, both in France and in England, for standard writers of genuine worth, and moreover of simple minds. That century will long survive the literary fame of its successor; yet what contempt must the infidels of the latter have felt for such men as the following:—

'Look, for example, at Morin, the botanist, "going to bed at seven o'clock at night all the year round, and rising at two in the morning. He spent three hours in prayer. Between five and six in summer, and in winter between six and seven, he went to the Hôtel-Dieu, and most frequently heard mass at Notre-Dame. On coming back, he read the Holy Scriptures, and dined at eleven o'clock. He next went to the Royal Garden, and remained in fine weather till two, examining new plants, and satisfying his first and strongest passion. After that, he shut himself up at home, unless he happened to have some poor people to visit." What a peaceful life! Would not one say he was entering one of those silent libraries on the very threshold of which one is tempted to uncover and almost to kneel?'—P. 24.

Or even for the two Corneilles:—

'This blessed calm enjoyed by the friends of science, was enjoyed also by almost all the friends of letters, alike the humblest and the most illustrious. See the two Corneilles, lodged the one above the other, and asking one another for words and verses through a hole opened in the ceiling.'—P. 25.

Or for the Abbé de Dangeau, who on hearing of the battle of Blenheim, affectionately laid his hand on his old bureau, and said, 'Come what may, I have safe here three thousand verbs, all rightly conjugated.'

The first link in the chain, which gradually led from these quiet worshippers of literature for its own sake, to the stormy disputants of the age of Voltaire, was the *good* Rollin. He was

claimed by the movement party as on their side, though himself unconscious of the honour, being wholly devoted to academical occupations. In spite, however, of his religious character, and in spite also of the fact that his writings were chiefly in Latin, he was yet supposed to be a man of progress, for he had an independence of character which brought him into collision with authorities both in Church and State.

'As a professor, he had preached the old rules, but with an independence of attitude, and a hardihood of taste, which amounted to a satire on pedants. As Rector of the University, he had upheld, when necessary, antiquated privileges; but even this had brought him into conflict with other authorities, and it was not forgotten that he had braved the archbishop.'—Pp. 30, 31.

Rollin's 'Ancient History' and 'Roman History' came out when he was in the enjoyment of unbounded favour, and met with a success that astonished him.

"Thus it was that the man who seemed the least fitted to belong to the eighteenth century, not only belonged to it, but became, through the force of circumstances, one of its foremost promoters."—P. 34.

Others, in their various ways, were made to aid on the cause.

'We might mention Vertot with his drowsy *Revolutions*, and d'Aguesseau with his serious *Discourses*. The former of these taught, unintentionally, what a revolted population could do; the latter taught men, under an absolute monarch, to lisp the language of the free. He called the Parliament the *senate*, and the councillors *senators;* he opened the way to declamations on the dignity of man, and the rights of virtue.'—P. 34.

The ashes of the dead were also disturbed to find witnesses in favour of the movement. Fénelon's was a name much to be desired, and accordingly his religious sentiments were made to bear the following construction.

'"What was religion in his view?" we find Maury asking himself, in 1771. "A sublime philosophy which demonstrates the order and the unity of Nature, and explains the enigma of the human heart, which, without it, is incomprehensible; the most powerful motive leading man to good, seeing faith places him constantly before the eye of the Divinity, and acts upon the will with as much sovereign power as it exercises over the thoughts; a supplement of the conscience, which commands, fortifies, and perfects all the virtues—establishes new bonds of good-will on the new relations of humanity—shows us, in the poor, creditors and judges; in our enemies, brethren; in the Supreme Being, a Father; the religion of the heart, virtue in action, the finest of all the codes of morality, and one whose every precept is a blessing from heaven. Such was Christianity in the eyes of Fénelon."'—Pp. 35, 36.

This was a philosophical, but not a real Fénelon. He had, however, been a man of opposition like Rollin, and therefore the movement party sympathized with him, and were determined to constr[illegible]s religion in a way that suited their own objects. M[illegible]lso cried up by the philosophers. All the poli[illegible] which occupied his latter years,

was at the sacrifice of a bold enunciation of Christian doctrine; and therefore Voltaire took him up, though no doubt his admiration for his style as a writer was genuine and sincere.

Meanwhile these opinions made rapid progress, encouraged by those concessions made from time to time by religious people in hope of attaining a common ground, on which persons of different opinions could unite. M. Bungener draws a moral from this, for the benefit of France, during the commotions of the last few years; and the same lesson is applicable to ourselves, and is, we think, felt by many to good purpose. Voltaire's tactics, in spreading his infidel opinions, were of a very artful kind in making himself all things to all men; they led him into the grossest flattery.

'During his last visit to Paris, Lemierre and Dubelloy called on him. "What consoles me in the prospect of death," said he, "is the thought that I shall leave behind MM. Dubelloy and Lemierre." So off they went, both mighty proud, yet each with no less mighty a contempt for the other. "Poor Dubelloy!" Lemierre would say, "he did not see in the least that Voltaire was laughing at him." "That poor fellow Lemierre!" the other would say, "he has taken it into his head that Voltaire was in earnest."' —P. 49.

He was very fond of the epithet 'great men,' so much the fashion in that age.

'Voltaire, to whom this title was most generally accorded, was also the most lavish in bestowing it on others. With it he paid his physician Tronchin, who, it is true, deserved it better than most men. He wrote to Vauvernargues: "This age did not deserve you; but so it is that it possesses you, and I bless Nature. I said a year ago that you are a great man." He wrote to Thomas: "You are made to celebrate great men. It is your vocation to portray your fellows." And when he loses Madame Chatelet, his female friend, as he could not, in good French, call her *grande femme*, it is still *grand homme*, great man, that we find him calling her when, in writing to the King of Prussia, he says, "I have lost a friend of five-and-twenty years' standing, a great man, who had but the one fault of being a woman."'—P. 50.

Voltaire sneered at Corneille for dedicating his 'Cinna' to M. de Moutauron the financier, and calling him another Augustus, but his own compliments to the rich Helvetius were much more fulsome. This man having written a few verses which were soon forgotten, Voltaire addresses him 'My dear rival, my poet, my philosopher.'

'But let a regal crown at last overpower his vision, or, at least, authorize his acting like a man whose sight is overpowered, we then find him out-Heroding Herod in the fulsomeness of his eulogies. It will be evident that we speak of his flatteries to the King of Prussia.'—P. 53.

This king was but a second-rate author, and often made sad blunders even in spelling, yet Voltaire's addresses to him are thus noticed:—

'Let us say nothing of mere words, for of these there is an infinite variety. *Great man* rarely occurs; it had become hackneyed. *Hero*, too, was rather too common a term; but as Frederick seemed not to disdain it, it is occasionally applied to him. *Genius* was very well in its way; but some such epithet as *universal* or *unique* is always studiously added. We shall not find the prince called a *great soul*, for that sounds rather classical; and then, too, he did not believe in the soul; but it must be *thirty souls in one body*, and that satisfied both. *Your Majesty* being too much of an old-world expression, it is made *Your Immensity*. Frederick is the *Solomon of the North*, and the eighteenth century is *the age of Frederick*.'—P. 54.

Humble enough in estimating his own powers, the king amply repaid this flattery:—

'Racine went very far, even for that period, when he maintained, that what most of all should encourage the Academy in its labours on the French language, was the thought of its serving, and being likely ever better and better to serve, for the celebration of the renown of Louis XIV.

'What in that poet's mouth had been a mere hyperbole for an occasion, Frederick made, in some sort, a reality in his relations with Voltaire. He seemed to study French only to enable him to praise Voltaire in his own tongue; and all those niceties of expression which he succeeded in reaching, well or ill, with his somewhat heavy pen, he was proud to offer, as a bouquet of French flowers raised in Germany, to the man to whose pages he had owed so much.'—P. 56.

Again:—

'"Your works would be enough to immortalize twenty great men." "None but a god could comprise in one person all the perfections you possess." "Fable tells us of a giant who had a hundred arms. You have a hundred geniuses; you embrace the whole universe, as Atlas bore it on his shoulders." "You are the first-born of thinking beings." "You are the hero of reason, the Prometheus of our days, who brought celestial light for the illumination of the blind." "Although I have come into the world too soon to be present at the triumph of philosophy, I do not regret it; I have seen Voltaire." "I will end my letter as Louis XIV. did his epistle to Boileau: *I admire, and am dumb.*"'—P. 58.

To show the very theoretical nature of the declamations against despotism which first issued forth from this school of philosophers, it is curious to find a work of Helvetius on this subject dedicated to the Empress of Russia, the most absolute sovereign in Europe. There was a strange fusion between the old and the new ideas. Many fancied themselves the friends of liberty, and sung its praises, who were little willing to bring home to themselves any practical inconsistency between their theories and their practice. Thus it was that democratic and infidel views sprung from the vices of the aristocracy, and that, as a class, it was made to rear up its own destroyers. It was a kind of intellectual refinement to enjoy the very inconsistency of advocating liberty and democracy, while at the same time practically revelling in a system which rested on the extreme

were forward young divines, who aimed at

old religious prejudices, and were apt to

enjoy this luxury at the expense of propriety, and occasionally met with a rebuff:—

'"I never shall forget that one evening, at supper, in the house of a young nobleman, a little abbé, dressed out like a doll, had set himself to divert the company at the expense of the old faith. When he came to speak of hell, which he called his *feu de joie*, an old army officer, the only one of the party that did not laugh, said to him: "Sir," looking at your uniform, I can plainly see what regiment you belong to: but it appears to me that you are a deserter." "Sir," he replied, continuing to smile, "there may be some truth in what you say; but I am not in my corps what you are in yours, a field officer." "Good!" replied the officer; "that you never should be, for judging by your conduct, you ought to have been hanged long ago." But few were like this field officer.'—P. 61.

But all power on the part of the Church to resist the spread of infidelity was prostrate. Even the Pope himself had no other course but to bribe Voltaire by actually sending him relics, which he gladly accepted:—

'"It is my destiny," said he, "to buffet Rome, and to make her subservient to my small desires. The experiment of *Mahomet* encourages me. I am making, accordingly, a pretty demand on the holy Father—no less than that of a gift of relics for my church, an indulgence *in articulo mortis*, and, during my lifetime, a capital bull for myself alone, granting me permission to cultivate the earth on holidays without being damned." In point of fact, a few months after, he writes: "I have received, on one and the same day, relics from the Pope and Madame de Pompadour's portrait. The relics consist of the hair shirt of St. Francis." '—P. 64.

Well might Voltaire be encouraged to say as follows:—

'I am tired of hearing them say that but twelve men were required to found their religion; I will clearly show them that no more than one is required for its destruction.'—P. 65.

It was the fashion at this time, M. Bungener says, for the aristocracy to place no faith in nobility. During the time of Louis XIV. inequality of rank was looked on by all classes as the natural state of man, to which all cheerfully submitted; yet it is strange, with the spread of democratic views under Louis XV., to observe the following results:—

'Towards the close of that reign, while equality was proclaimed on the housetops, access to the higher ranks of the army was closed against the commonalty (*roturiers*) by a more formal *ordonnance* than any that had yet appeared. And even in the ranks of the commonalty, distinctions became more marked than ever. Never had precedency among trades and employments been more strictly observed than after people began to talk of abolishing the corporations—those old aristocracies of the wareroom and the workshop. A lady of high rank wanted a coachman; she found one who seemed likely to suit her. "But," said he, "before engaging myself, I should like my lady to say to whom my lady gives precedency in the streets." "To everbody," she replied. "If others give it me, I take it; if not, I wait my turn." "In that case," the man rejoined, "I cannot close with Madame. I never give place to any but princes of the blood." Mark that this great lord in livery, whose name was Girard, ended with being a red-hot demo-

crat. In 1793, being appointed public accuser, he sent to the scaffold those very aristocrats who were not aristocratical enough, in his opinion, in 1780.'—P. 69.

Two causes are noted by M. Bungener as active stimulants to the progress of these views; first their novelty, and then the extreme caution that was necessary in putting them forward. The press was subjected to severe scrutiny. The freedom enjoyed in England even then was a means of spoiling the interest in views which it was agreeable to publish by stealth:—

'Montesquieu, Voltaire himself, on their arrival in England, found the fruits of English liberty almost too much for their taste. Every morning, on reading the opposition newspapers, they seemed to think that not only the ministry, but the monarchy itself, would be shivered to atoms within four-and-twenty hours. Who, then, could wonder at the effect produced in France by the first echoes, feeble as they were, of that confounding din which had frightened Voltaire on his setting foot on a free soil?'—P. 72.

It is rather a fault of the present day, that public writers have, to exaggerate in order to create any impression; whereas, under a severely scrutinized press, a hidden meaning is imputed to every word; the imagination is tickled and interest excited, where, if all were open, the subject would pass by unheeded.

The same rule is applied to the stage—an important influence in that age, and a ready instrument for propagating new ideas. An instance of this scrutiny we give our readers:—

'In 1768, it was *Ericie, or the Vestal*, by a now forgotten author, Fontenelle, that was to receive its sentence. Approved by the players, it was rejected by the censorship, in consequence of its being, in what it says of vestals, full of allusions to conventual cunning. But reclamations and agitation following, it was sent by the lieutenant of police—to whom does the reader think?—to the archbishop, with a request for his opinion. The archbishop, great in excommunicating comedians, was doubtless prepared to reply that he could not, in any case, approve of a play. Not at all. He appointed a commission, composed of parish priests and doctors. Upon their advice, after a long examination, the piece was anew forbidden. The printing of it was also prohibited. It needs not be said that forthwith it was printed—that the prohibition promoted the sale, and even enhanced its reputation.'—P. 76.

One great power possessed by Voltaire in working a cause was that of sinking opportu ities for empty personal display, and using all his efforts to combine men of all opinions into one common body by a sec d cunning influence over their fancies. Hence arose h ing flatteries, and his total called the 'citizen king:' almost alone, the march itted that the bridge on ted with cannon and nworthy monarch is

said to have 'deserved well of the human race,' and had the title invented for him of 'well-beloved.' It is wholly an erroneous idea that court flattery, and the connivance at regal immorality, were objects of disgust and attack by the movement party. That party, on the contrary, exceeded all others in such offences:—

'Louis XV.'s mistresses had the *Encyclopédie* at their feet. That advancing wave which respected nothing, paused, with a humble and courteous deference, before adultery enthroned at the fireside of the King of France. History even took alarm when the past might displease the present. In sending to the Duke de Richelieu a copy of the *Age of Louis XIV.*, "I flatter myself," writes Voltaire, "that if the king had time to read this work, he would not be displeased with it. I believe, in particular, that Madame de Pompadour might not disapprove of the manner in which I speak of Mesdames de la Vallière, de Montespan, and de Maintenon." But it was long since Madame de Pompadour could reckon on him. From the very dawn of her power, he had hailed her rise with his most graceful verses; had openly claimed the honour of being her admirer, her knight, her poet.' —P. 93.

There is something almost inhuman in Voltaire's venomous pertinacity in pursuit of his end. Of this same lady it is said:—

'On her dying bed she was soothed with the homage he paid to her.'—P. 93.

Nor did he cease then:—

'The woman, despicable in a very different way, who succeeded her in the royal favour, became in her turn the muse of the Ferney patriarch, reviving, at the mature age of eighty, all the poetical fervour of his early days.'—P. 93.

The wretched old man, in 1773, writes to this mistress of the equally wretched old Louis XV.:—

'"M. de Laborde," he continues, "has shown me your portrait. Don't be angry, Madam, at my having used the freedom to give back the two kisses to it.

'"To men possessing eyes, you can't say nay,
When homage to your portrait they would pay,
To it alone dare mortals show their love,
The original was made for gods above."'—P. 94.

Thus it was not real abuses that were attacked in an open way, but religion and the crown were made to ruin themselves by this fiendish deceiver. Yet Voltaire all this time went to mass and kept his Lent; in 1761 he writes thus:—

'Had I a hundred thousand men, I well know what I would do; but as I have not, I mean to communicate at Easter, and you may call me hypocrite as much as you please.'—P. 96, note.

The death, however, of a philosopher is always Voltaire's crowning triumph:—

'"Dubois died swearing; I don't say like a heathen, for the heathen did not swear—but like a madman; yet he died," says Voltaire, "a philosopher,"'—P. 96.

His persecution of the Christian faith led him not only to satirize all ages and scenes of life among those mortals who were contemporaneous with himself, but it distorted all his views of past history. The Jews were his detestation, because they prepared for the coming of Christ. Moses was his especial dislike; whereas pagans, especially those who had been active persecutors of the Christian faith, always claim his sympathy. Julian the apostate is his great favourite, and all the tyranny and cruelty of the Roman emperors, so far as it touched Christians, find in him a willing apologist. The Mahometans he only half likes, because they believe in Moses; whereas, of all existing nations on the earth, he chiefly commends the Chinese, because their history displays for the greatest length of time a certain amount of civilization, with a total freedom from any connexion with the inspired records which Christians acknowledge. Catherine II. is lauded as the 'soul of the universe,' because she was an infidel; and, after she had murdered her husband, he writes to a friend in the following tone of excusing mildness:—

'You see how she behaves to the French, and you will feel certain that the late gentleman, her husband, will be thought to have been in the wrong by posterity.'—P. 114.

The following suggests ideas which, we hope, are as contrasted with France of the present day, in sentiment, as in the position she occupies in the balance of European power:—

'Does she make war on the Turks—not a paltry village is taken by her troops but he sets himself to sing her praises as the goddess of battles. Dying, he says—he had been dying for seventy years—he leapt out of bed to receive a letter in which she announced to him a victory. He chanted a *Te Deum*, "or rather a *Te Deam*." "This was not," says he, "from a fever of the brain, but from a fever of the heart." But, brain or heart, the anti-christian is always there. Know you wherefore he rejoices at Catherine's successes? Not, you may well believe, that Christ may re-enter Constantinople; but Catherine, victorious on the Bosphorus, will push on, he hopes, to Jerusalem, will recall the Jews, rebuild the ancient temple—and Christ will have lied.'—P. 114.

We cannot follow M. Bungener in his protracted refutation of the assertion, that infidelity was the daughter of the Reformation. One historical correction, however, we must suggest. He considers that English infidelity died out with the Stuarts, and that after their dynasty we may trace a revival of religion. The great age of infidel opinions in England corresponds too much with that of France for this to be a correct statement. The eighteenth century was far from an age of revival in religion; and although we were mercifully rescued from the extremes of France, yet it cannot be questioned that we partook much of the prevailing evil; to such an extent, indeed, that Voltaire, judging

from our literary men of his time, had good reason for claiming England as a great witness to his own infidel views. M. Bungener asks why Voltaire should have so hated Calvin, if he could have traced to him the origin of infidelity. He answers this question himself. It was because Calvin caused the execution of the infidel Servetus. That was Calvin's personal share in the contests of his day, and Voltaire takes his side accordingly, with the martyr of his own opinions.

The disquisition on the drama of the eighteenth century, as illustrating the feelings of the age, contains many very sound criticisms, which are full of general interest. The absence of good comedy is remarked as being the general concomitant of an age devoted to wit.

'And here, it strikes us, we must look for the explanation of a fact which has created much surprise, the inferiority, namely, of comedy in an age when there was so much wit.

'How are we to account for this failure? After all that has been said, a very short answer may suffice. People were ever in pursuit of what was false in sentiment, and comedy essentially requires what is true.'—P. 204.

Wit is here, of course, presumed to be a shallow kind of humour, which rests on artificial and untrue habits of life or tone of mind. Such, no doubt, was the wit of France in the age we are discussing. A mixture of pomposity, falsehood, and the meanest vanity, could produce no real wit in any high sense of the word.

'Hence it is that wit does not suffice for the composition of a good comedy. Let us say, rather, from the moment that wit predominates, it becomes a positive hindrance to success. Comedy requires a profound study of the caprices of the human heart, and wit stops at the surface, where a single glance suffices for its entertainment for better or worse. Comedy wants cheerfulness, wit has nothing but sarcasm. Comedy wants good humour, wit has none. Comedy, notwithstanding the lightness of her outward garb, requires to be written seriously, and wit would think it beneath her if she did not treat comedy with raillery and jests. Grimm goes too far when he says, that "comic poets have been, for the most part, melancholy and serious people;" but he is right when he adds, "M. de Voltaire is too gay, and gay comedy is the only kind of writing in which he has not succeeded. The reason is, that he who laughs and he who causes laughter are two very different persons."

'Thus it was that Voltaire, with more wit than Molière, fell so far short of him. He laughs, but does not make others laugh; I mean with that hearty honest laugh, without which there can be no true success in comedy. He laughs, but one would say that he wants only to divert himself; one is almost tempted to take offence at his railleries, and to side with those whom he means to hit.'—P. 204.

Tragedy, M. Bungener says truly, can best dispense with truth, 'because it raises us too much above the level of our everyday sentiments to make it easy for us to follow it, to test it, step by step, by our own experience.' Tragedy was preferred

by a laughing generation as an artificial exercise of feelings, which are excluded from practical life, yet are instincts of Nature that desire gratification. It was also the means of indulging in an equally unreal love of virtue and good principles of conduct. The stage is often the very opposite to the real life of an age.

'Few, then, were so infatuated as to be altogether blind to the extent to which all the old foundations of morals were shaken; few, very few, really had any faith in the new foundations laid by philosophy. Hence, among the great majority, there was a desire to have their minds set at ease, with respect either to the part they might have taken in the subversion of the former, or to the solidity of the latter.

'Now, they had but two ways of thus re-assuring themselves, one only of which was good—namely, to be virtuous. But this was difficult, and they had little taste for it. There remained the bad method—that of allowing their feelings to be affected at spectacles of virtue; and as few of these occurred in actual life, they must needs go in search of them to the playhouse. A play, then, was all the better the more easily it caused those emotions, and elicited those tears, which were to reconcile people with themselves. "People talk of war. Our gallants greatly desire it, and our ladies are but moderately cast down at the thought. It is a long while since they have tasted the high seasoning of the terrors and the pleasures of a campaign; they want to see how much the absence of their lovers will afflict them." At the theatre, also, the people wanted to see whether, and how, they would find themselves affected.' P. 213.

This contrast between actual life and contemporaneous dramatic tastes, was strangely illustrated during the Revolution itself. During the horrors of that time, when blood and torture were daily and accustomed spectacles, and had ceased to create any feeling of the horrible—when the Grève was never empty—when prisons were full of all refinements of cruelty without exciting the smallest sense of pity—at that very time the theatres represented no spectacles which could shock the most delicate nerves.

'People went to the Grève to look on while human beings were torn with red-hot pincers, broken on the wheel, and quartered; yet every tragic hero who dared to perish otherwise on the stage than by the ancient method of poison, or the old poignard of the classics, was denounced as a bungler, a man unworthy to die in good society. This contradiction, we may remark, was itself inherited from the ancients. At the circus, blood flowed in streams in good earnest; at the theatre, it was not allowed to flow even in a figure.'—P. 217.

The scenes of the English stage at this same time astonished the French. Linquet, in his 'Annales,' says:—

'In England executions are mere child's-play in comparison with ours; the tragedies are butcheries. . . . Hamlet is the quintessence of all the horrors that the frenzied brain of a lunatic could conceive. . . . The grave-diggers, in the fifth act, dig an actual grave. They toss out on the stage a black earth, precisely of the colour and unctuousness of that found in graveyards. This earth is full of real bones, actual skulls, which the

men lift with their shovels. . . . And all this is well received; and all present, men, women, girls, sailors, lawyers, merchants, lords, all, in short, are in an ecstasy.'—P. 220.

The rough boldness of Shakspeare would have been ill received by the majestic sovereign, who called out, at the sight of one of the interiors of Teniers: 'Take away—take away these baboons.'

The position of actors in society had long been somewhat anomalous. They were condemned by the Church, and excommunicated. They could not, therefore, be married or receive Christian burial, yet they were treated with great distinction. Molière, long so beloved by Louis XIV., was refused burial by the Archbishop of Paris. Many evasions were resorted to with the connivance of the clergy. The stage was renounced on the eve of matrimony, and forthwith resumed; while churches, exempt from the Archbishop's jurisdiction, were found in which to have burials celebrated. This state of things remained until the Revolution, without any fundamental relief, though the title of members of the king's household was always granted to those who acted before royalty.

The position of dramatic authors was also exposed to peculiar trials. They were at the mercy of the public for an immediate judgment on their works, which one way or the other was fearfully decisive. The first bringing out of a play was therefore a critical moment for the nerves of the author.

'A play might reach the fifth act without the public having pronounced, without showing symptoms of being prepared to pronounce, and often, in fact, without its having any leaning either for or against the play. But as custom required that, before separating, the spectators should settle its fate, no more was wanted, at that last moment, than any circumstance, however slight—a verse, a word, a nothing—to make the multitude determine one or the other way, so as to overwhelm the author either with condemnation or applause. It was universal suffrage preluding, on the playhouse benches, to those more serious caprices of which it is now giving us the spectacle. The mob became intoxicated with this sovereignty of an evening. It seemed to fear lest its right might not be sufficiently vindicated, if it was not exercised with the suddenness of tyranny.'—P. 307.

Marmontel thus describes such an occasion as happening to himself:—

'In those days the author of a new play had set apart for himself and his friends a small barred box, in the third tier, over the proscenium, the seat in which, I may truly say, was like a bundle of thorns. I repaired to it half an hour before the rise of the curtain, and, till then, preserved sufficient fortitude amid my fears. But at the noise made by the curtain as it rose, my blood froze in my veins. In vain they tried to revive me with *liqueurs*; I swooned quite away. It was only at the end of the first monologue, at the noise of the plaudits, that I regained my consciousness. From that moment all went on well, and from better to better, until there came the passage in the fourth act with which I had been so threatened.

But as that moment approached, I was seized with such a fit of trembling, that, without exaggeration, my teeth chattered in my mouth. Were the great revolutions that take place in the soul and in the senses, mortal, I should have died from that which took place within me when—at the happy violence done to the spectators by the sublime Clarion in pronouncing the verse: "Go, then, fear nothing," &c.,—the whole playhouse shook with redoubled applause. Never from a more sensible fear did one pass to so sudden and sensible a joy; and, during all that remained of the play, this latter feeling agitated my heart and soul with such violence, that I could breathe only in sobs.'—Pp. 307, 308.

One author we are told of, who experienced a sudden condemnation of his play, and who in his excitement rushed on the stage to assure the assembly that his characters were true to life; and on being laughed at for his explanatory remarks, tossed his hat into the pit, and offered to fight the first man who took it up.

Voltaire never agitated himself in this way. He was of a calmer temperament, and accepted the verdict of the public with much good will, even if not favourable. He had indeed the public well at his command, and was not called on to endure much; but still he had sensations of being 'exposed to the wild beasts,' though he had the practical sense to accept the decision of these wild beasts as a final verdict, and to set about altering such passages as displeased them. It was indeed his art to feel the opinions of that class whose judgment he regarded, and adapt himself accordingly. He could exercise most influence over them by always taking his station near them, and never, by any extravagant or unpopular sentiments, separating himself from them.

Voltaire has gained very great renown for his indefatigable industry, and for the voluminous amount of his literary productions. Compared with the majority of French writers, his sixty or seventy volumes sound imposing; but as compared, on the other hand, with the mass of work got through by literary men, it certainly appears that Voltaire, in his very long life, and with his great facility of composition, need not have distressed himself. The *habit* or profession, however, of writing was not recognised by many of the old French authors, as we understand it in days of periodical literature, when a man does not rest on his oars after having written one treatise, and repose on the fame of authorship thus easily acquired. The present manner of writing may be too hasty and ill-digested, but instances of the other extreme, such as the following, certainly appear very slow:—

'We shall not go back to Malherbe, who maintained, that after writing a poem of a hundred lines, one ought to repose for a year. Tallemant's *Historiettes* give some curious details on the sluggishness of the father of French poetry, or rather of French versification. A friend, who had lost

his wife, asked him to write some verses on this calamity, and by the time they were made, his friend had married again.

'The seventeenth and the eighteenth century saw many authors who never wrote more than a single volume all their lives. The greater number, shall we be told, did well in keeping to that? No doubt; but there were some, too, whom posterity would have been happy to greet with a heavier baggage.

'Look at Boileau. Some have amused themselves with calculating how many lines of verse he wrote. From 1660 to 1670, a little more than two thousand; from 1670 to 1680, a little more than three thousand; from 1680 to 1690, none; from 1690 to 1700, less than a thousand; from 1700 to 1705, eight or nine hundred. This gives a total of seven thousand, spread over forty-five years; being about two days and a half for each line. In his most fertile period (1670 to 1680), you have not a line a day; and when, after ten years' intermission, he begins to rhyme again, we find four days for every line he produced.'—P. 316.

Racine was many years without producing anything; and Crebillon went on announcing a play called 'Catilina' for twenty-two years, till the wits said, 'Quousque tandem, Catilina!' When its author was near eighty, it at length appeared. Nor were the profits of authors exorbitant. Voltaire did not live on literature, for the only pay of any consequence he ever had was for an edition of the 'Henriade' issued in London in 1726. The propagation of infidelity, however, was his stimulus, and he had no occasion to seek for money.

'He had inherited from his father and his brother about two hundred thousand livres, and he possessed, at his death, nearly two hundred thousand livres of income.'—P. 322.

The securities in which this money was invested have before been alluded to.

'Accordingly, until 1754, his whole fortune was in paper securities; like Bias, he could say that he carried all that he had about with him. His portfolio, we are told, presented a prodigious chaos, with his two or three millions of livres in minute parcels, contracts, letters of exchange, acknowledgments of debt, bills of all kinds and all forms. But even he liked to wander in this wilderness of papers. He might well bewail a little the embarrassments which he was continually meeting there, contested claims, lawsuits, small losses and great ones; but just as high-mettled horses need something more than ordinary work for the damping of their fire, so Voltaire needed something over and above literature, for the absorption of a part of that ardour which he could not have thrown entirely into it without going too much beyond what governments could tolerate. With the energy which he threw into nothing more than his quarrel with the President de Brosses about the cutting down of some trees, he would have overwhelmed a score of enemies with a score of satires.

'This, however, was not always the view that he took. "You tell me," he writes one day to D'Argental, "that it is my lawsuits that impoverish my imagination. On the contrary, they throw me into a passion, and that excites me." At this epoch, it is true, his lawsuits had undergone a change. It was now the feudal proprietor of Ferney battling with the clergy of the neighbourhood.'—P. 322.

Voltaire did not seek persecution, or the notoriety and influence which it might give him. He carefully guarded against it, and made himself superior to it. He did not covet the dangerous proximity to authority which a residence at the court would have entailed; he remained at his retreat on the confines of three kingdoms; and by his writings, his correspondence, and liberal hospitality, gained a strange ubiquitous influence, which was more effective to his purpose, more congenial with his natural love of repose, and better suited to his imagined state of health, than the bustle of Versailles. The publication of the scandalous and impure 'La Pucelle' threatened him with a storm. He had taken great delight in its composition, and it came before the world in a somewhat premature and mutilated form, having in fact been distributed piecemeal among his friends, and come thus into possession of some one who published it with additions. This gave him the opportunity of denying its authorship totally, and professing the greatest indignation, when it was imputed to him.

'"The crowning-point of these infamous manœuvres," he wrote to the *Journal Encyclopédique*, "is the publication of a poem intituled *La Pucelle d'Orléans* (The Maid of Orleans). The publisher has the effrontery to attribute this poem to the author of the *Henriade*, of *Zaire*, of *Mérope*, of *Alzire*, of the *Age of Louis XIV*. . . . People dare to attribute to him the dullest, lowest, grossest poem, that could issue from the press. The pen refuses to transcribe the tissue of sottish and abominable obscenities of that work of darkness."'—P. 327.

He was exceedingly touchy of any libel, especially of a satirical kind; and he was a singular instance of the common rule, that satirical people are least fond of satire, professing even to be unconscious of their own.

'The most satirical of men protested, on all occasions, that he neither could be nor desired to be satirical. "I have prohibited my mind from being satirical," he says. And elsewhere: "Were I to follow my own taste, I should never speak of satire but to inspire people with a horror for it, and to arm virtue against that dangerous kind of writing. Satire is almost always unjust, and that is its least fault."'—P. 329.

The health of Voltaire was a perpetual subject of his thoughts By nature of a weakly constitution, he always imagined himself failing, and spoke like a dying man when fifty years of work was still before him.

'His ailments—for he had very real ones, and we ought not, because he complained too much, to refuse him all pity—his ailments were all connected with this perpetual excitement. Did the originating cause lie in the mind or in the body? Voltaire himself, especially in his cynical old age, loved to speak only of the machine being out of order; and he is certainly one of those who have expended, as was said, most mind in demonstrating that they were only beasts. Let us do him more honour than he did to himself, and admit at least an equality of influence in the two parts of which he was made up. There was evidently an action and a reaction betwixt the fevers of the body and the great fever of the mind.'—P. 333.

He often received his guests with the remark, 'You find me a dying man.' Yet see what followed.

'Behold the dying man gets out of bed, spends the whole day with them, gives their ears no rest with his babbling about Paris, about the Encyclopædists, about Pompignan, who had dared to attack them in the discourse delivered at his reception—Pompignan, his *bête noire* for the time; for his physician had ordered him, he said, by way of exercise, "to abuse Pompignan for an hour or two every morning!" He dined with them, he supped with them. He regaled them with the songs of M. de l'Ecluse, his host, formerly actor at the *Opéra-Comique*, and then dentist to the King of Poland; and when they thought he must be quite exhausted, and sighing for his bed, behold, he sets himself to recite two new parts of his beloved *Pucelle*, and cannot think of allowing them to retire!'—P. 336.

Voltaire pretended strangely, at the latter part of his life, to be fond of agriculture. He appears to have had a dim vision at times that something was wanting in the philosophy of his age. The love of nature was wholly unknown in France, and he himself had done nothing but encourage its exclusion.

'It was not until he got to the borders of the lake of Geneva, in 1755, that nature began to be something in his regard. Until then he had never seen it; not a single gleam of it had ever been allowed to fall either on his verses or on his prose. A journey to him was a broad highway and a certain number of inns. In Germany, he had never contrived to get beyond complaining of the severity of the climate, and the absence of comfort in the house accommodation. To England he had gone in search of men and books. These he found, but never dreamt of looking for anything else. We do not perceive, at least, that the rich poetical character of British scenery had fixed itself at all in his memory, or that it had left any impression on his heart.'—P. 339.

Once, and only once, he used his poetic talents in praise of nature. The lines are well known, but we repeat the translation here given. The scene is the lake of Geneva:—

'How, on this spot doth all delight the sense
Astonish'd at the scene's magnificence!
See that calm ocean's waves translucent kiss
The flowery margin of those fields of bliss. . .

Lo, what a scene of snow, and glory too,
Those mountain solitudes present to view.
Then let the Roman tyrant's flatterer
In numbers soothing to his patron's ear,
Let Maro, in harmonious Georgic strains,
No longer vaunt his lovely native plains,
And lakes with shores magnificently grand,
Dug out by nature in Italian land.
Mine is the premier lake. Upon its sides
Th' eternal goddess of mankind resides.
Soul of great projects, aim of great desires,
Here freedom dwells. . . .

Thy throne, O Freedom! is established here. . . .
When Friendship calls thee to her calm retreat,
Grace with thy presence her soft grassy seat;
Like thee, she courts abhors, and shuns, like thee,

The world's cabals and its frivolity.
Twofold the charm that these twin pow'rs endears;
While the one elevates, the other cheers;
May both my life inspire, solace and guide!
Both at my death triumphantly preside!'—Pp. 343, 344.

It was with an immense peal of laughter that Paris greeted this poetic enthusiasm about mountains and snow. Voltaire, true to his principles, did not encounter ridicule again. Other things, however, besides the poetry of the age, proved the total absence of sentiment corresponding to what we understand by the love of nature.

'With their alleys always straight, their geometrical thickets, their trees mercilessly cut into pyramids or spheres, the gardens and the parks of that epoch harmonized with the inspirations of the poets, as well as with the invariably square châteaux that were built on the despised ruins of the old ancestral donjon towers.'—P. 345.

M. Bungener follows up this last remark with some true and thoughtful criticisms on the connexion which may always be observed between the adoption of Gothic art and the love of nature, and, on the other hand, between the contempt of that style in art and great coldness to all natural beauties.

'Now, never have art and nature been more strictly united than during the long period of the Middle Ages. We shall not inquire whether the clustered and branching pillars of our cathedrals were meant to simulate the interior of a forest; we speak only of that intimate, profound, unalterable alliance, that had been formed in men's souls between the love of art and the love of nature. On this subject there is a fine passage in Michelet—a little mystical, perhaps, but which, if better reasoned, would be less true. "Our Norman cathedrals," says he, "are singularly numerous, beautiful, and varied; their daughters in England are prodigiously rich, delicate, and subtilely elaborated. But mystical genius is more strongly marked, it seems, in the churches of Germany. There was in that country a land well prepared, a soil expressly fitted for producing the flowers of Christ. Nowhere have man and nature, brother and sister, exhibited beneath the Father's eye a purer or more infantine love. The German soul takes kindly to flowers, to trees, to beautiful hills consecrated to God; and with these it has built miracles of art, as, at the birth-time of the child Jesus, they dress out the Christmas-tree covered over with garlands, ribbons, and girandoles, for the delight of children. It was there that the Middle Ages produced golden souls, who have passed away without being known to fame—ingenuous souls, at once puerile and profound, who had hardly any consciousness of time, who never left the bosom of eternity, letting the world roll past them, without distinguishing in its stormy waves anything but the blue of heaven.'

'These ingenuous and profound souls—who saw art in nature, nature in art, and God the supreme artist everywhere—were never more rare than in the eighteenth century. Of that mysterious union, of this great fact, which they had read on the front of the stars, and which they wrote on the front of their temples, who was there that then was capable of conceiving the very statement? Could the believers of that time have understood it any better than the unbelievers? There was wanting in all, what constitutes the true sentiment of art—that of nature. 'If nature has not been

felt, the arts, which merely transform nature, and bring together her scattered rays in order to produce a unique and profound emotion, will become powerless.'—P. 346.

Voltaire had an utter abhorrence for Gothic art, as barbarous. He was for pulling down Notre Dame itself in order to erect a temple 'more worthy of the capital.' St. Paul's Cathedral, in our own metropolis, was an object of peculiar envy; and to express his dislike to Corneille, he adds, after all other abuse he can think of, that 'his pieces resemble fine Gothic churches.'

This severance between art and nature had much to do with all the errors of French philosophy. It was Rousseau's starting-point, in the idea that human nature was good till spoiled by civilisation. Heathen art never at any time recognised the human mind as being the work of God, equally with all nature, animate and inanimate. It was reserved for Christian times to harmonise man's powers of sense, and his intellect, with the world in which he lives, so that it may become his noble privilege and his greatest pleasure to use the talents that are given him in the work of identifying the praises of his Maker with a deep appreciation of those things which God created to be around us, and to administer to our good.

It was the total neglect of such truths as these that made Rousseau say that 'the savage state is the true state of man.' One condition, which he amusingly yet prudently makes, in order that this savage state may be the most desirable one is, that the typical savage 'shall have dined.'

'"The savage man," he says, "when he has dined, is at peace with universal nature and the friend of all his fellow-men."'—P. 375.

Before dinner the same individual, M. Bungener thinks, would not be so firm a supporter of the rights of others. But Voltaire and Rousseau, whether we look on the former as the enemy of the old religion, or the latter of the old political state of things, both come to the same conclusion in expounding a pure despotism. Rousseau would have a religion, and one not only encouraged by the State, but enforced by it; that is, he would persecute all who exceeded the bounds laid down for them, and he would look on all those who were not included in this system as the outcasts of mankind. Practically, therefore, no man had a profounder contempt for the lower orders than he had; for he saw, plainly enough, that the aristocracy sympathised more with his theories than did the peasants and the poorer classes. In the religious question, Voltaire's view is thus expressed:—

'Voltaire—and it is a trait which would hardly be forgiven him at the present day, but that his friends take care to say nothing about it—Voltaire teaches, in many places, that the enlightenment of the people should not

even be attempted; he even goes so far—and this assuredly, in him, implies the last degree of contempt—as to say that even their conversion to infidelity should not be attempted. In a letter to the King of Prussia, we find him say: "Your Majesty will do an eternal service to the human race by destroying that infamous superstition, I do not say among the *canaille*, who are not worth being enlightened, and for whom all yokes are proper, but among persons of credit, among men who think. . . . It is for you to feed their souls; it is for you to give white bread to the children of the family, and to leave the black bread to the dogs." '—P. 443.

And again—

'"We shall soon have new heavens and a new earth," he writes to D'Alembert—"I mean for people of credit; for as for the *canaille*, the stupidest heaven and the stupidest earth are all that they require." '—P. 444.

But small liberty would exist under such principles. It is an ideal *man* which the philosophers alone considered; they cared not for men. What greater despotism, then, can there be, than the upholding of a self-conceived ideal which all must copy, or be excluded from every civil right; nay, from the right itself to live; for the Revolution afterwards developed these principles even to this fatal excess.

We have not space, however, to follow M. Bungener through all his political examinations of French philosophy. He warns France of modern times to profit by the lesson of the last century. In the principles of very many of that school, he traces the one conclusion, that the ideal liberty there taught is nothing but despotism.

England has cause to be thankful that the infidelity of last century was not allowed to arrive at the same climax, or bring down the same judgments; but although checked, enough has lingered on to prove the narrowness of our escape. The book before us plainly identifies much that has been said by politicians, within our own memory, with the philosophy of the eighteenth century. That view of religious liberty which only energizes by persecuting earnest partisans in the cause of the Church, and which seems always well disposed to accept the State as the fit and proper government for a national religion, is all very congenial in its character with the sentiments of Rousseau. There have also been followers of Voltaire, both in literary and political circles, who have united with every wave of discontent that may have agitated the country, and striven to make men sceptics. But the difference, as regards success, is remarkable. In England these principles have never spread sufficiently, even in the class from which they took their origin, to bring about any great or overwhelming catastrophe. In France, the case has unfortunately been the reverse. Yet, to the nations at large, we trust that now there is not so great a difference between the two as history might lead

one to expect. In both countries there is now a revival of religion, and a longing for peaceful union among civilized nations. The history of a class has not proved in France to be the history of a nation, though all may for a time have suffered. There is a reverence for religion in the French people which has surmounted the waves of infidelity, and made her again Christian, in spite of the storms that have passed over her. May France and our own country be henceforth as well agreed in the general advancement of religion, and of all peaceful works—whether in art, literature or industry, as now they are united in the cause of justice and national freedom, against tyranny and oppression.

ART. VI.—1. *Memoirs of the Wesley Family; collected from original Documents. By* ADAM CLARKE, LL.D. F.A.S. Second Edition. 2 vols. London: Tegg. 1843.

2. *An Account of the Rise and Progress of the Religious Societies in the City of London, &c. By* JOSIAH WOODWARD, D.D. Sixth Edition. London. 1744.

3. *The Pious Communicant, &c., with Appendix relating to our Religious Societies. By* SAMUEL WESLEY, M.A., *Rector of Epworth, in the Diocese of Lincoln.* London. 1700.

4. *Some Account of the Societies for Reformation of Manners, &c.* London. 1699.

5. *Sermons by* ANTHONY HORNECK, D.D., *late Preacher at the Savoy. To which is added, The Life of the Author, by* RICHARD (KIDDER), *Lord Bishop of Bath and Wells.* Vol. I. London. 1706.

6. *The Nature, Design, and General Rules of the United Societies in London, Bristol, &c.* 1739. Works of Rev. John Wesley, Vol. VIII. London. 1830.

7. *Rules of the Band Societies.* 1738. Ibid.

IT is not among the least remarkable proofs of the amazing influence obtained by John Wesley over the minds of his followers and adherents, that such a man as Adam Clarke should have employed himself in collecting the history of the several members of the Wesley family, fondly tracing the possible origin of the name to an Arabic or Spanish source, and pointing out the meaning in Arabic, as that of *Father of Union*, or *Uniting Father*. We do not propose to investigate this part of his subject. But there is one fact connected with the establishment of Wesley's system which we believe to have been hitherto almost wholly overlooked or disregarded, and to which we desire to call attention, on account of its important bearing on our own times, and on the present wants and necessities of our Church. It appears that Samuel Wesley, the father, successively Rector of South Ormsby[1] and of Epworth in Lincolnshire, and Convo-

[1] Dr. Clarke has fallen into repeated mistakes about the connexion of Samuel Wesley with this place, for want of consulting the Bishop's Register. He tells a story, p. 107, related by John Wesley, of his father's first living having been given him by a nobleman who kept a mistress, and that this person *would* visit his wife, which he prevented; and having guessed this nobleman to have been the Marquis of Normanby (Sheffield, afterwards Duke of Buckingham), whose chaplain he afterwards was, he refers to this matter again as proved at pages 193, 204, and 205;

cation Proctor for that diocese, a man of letters and of eminent piety, was one of the promoters of those *Religious Societies* in the Church of England, of which an account was published by Dr. Woodward, and of which Bishop Kidder, in his Life of Dr. Horneck, gave some further particulars. Our object will be to trace the connexion which we believe to have existed between these Societies, and that which Charles Wesley, first, and then his brother John, established at Oxford, and which was undoubtedly the germ of modern Methodism. In doing this, it will be necessary first to give some account of these Societies themselves, and this the rather as some of their most abiding results still remain to the Church of England, in the Societies for Promoting Christian Knowledge and for the Propagation of the Gospel, as well as in the great efforts for the education of the poor, carried on by the former of these two Societies for a century before the institution of the National Society.

In Robert Nelson's 'Address to Persons of Quality,' published in 1715, we find the Religious Societies spoken of in the following terms:—

'If a few persons, on no account considerable, and whose names are hardly known, being of the Church of England, by their frequently meeting together to pray, sing psalms, and read the Holy Scriptures, and to edify one another by their religious conferences, have, through their united endeavours and the grace of God, been enabled to do so much as they have done; and to propagate and form themselves into such societies as those that are called *religious societies* have been able to do; if they have been so instrumental in promoting the daily service among churches, with the regular administration of the Holy Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ every Lord's-day, and in some churches also every holyday in the year; as well as other excellent designs conformable to the practice of the primitive days and to the established constitution of this best reformed Church; . . . . . and have contributed more than a little, while under the direction of their spiritual superiors, to revive the true spirit of Christianity by their charities and devotions: how much more easy would it be for persons of quality,' &c. And again, 'Some of the methods which have been taken for this end, have been the setting up several societies and funds for the more frequent and devout attendance on the divine service; for the religious observance of fasts and festivals by authority appointed; for the more exact conformity to the rules of the Catholic Church, and of the Church of England in particular; for the suppressing vice and immorality; for promoting true knowledge and piety, and for proselyting to the established doctrine and constitution such as have erred and gone astray from it, for want of due information and instruction.'[1]

---

and this account is followed by Archdeacon Stonehouse in his History of the Isle of Axholme, where Epworth is situated. But it appears from the Bishop's Register that he was instituted to South Ormsby, June 25, 1690, on the presentation of a private family, who were then, as now, the patrons. The fact is that the house belonging to this family was rented during the minority of the owner by another nobleman, Lord Castleton, some of whose family were connected with that of the tron; so that nothing is more natural than that *he* should have obtained the ing for Wesley, though he did not present him.

[1] Address to Persons of Quality and Estate, pp. 137—139.

The same excellent person had before said, in the preface to his 'Fasts and Festivals,' which was first published in 1703:—

'Upon this occasion, I think it a great piece of justice to acknowledge and commend the pious and devout practices of the religious societies; who in this point, as well as in many others, distinguish themselves by their regular conformity and obedience to the laws of the Church; for they constantly attend the public assemblies upon such holy seasons. And till they can communicate regularly in their own parish churches upon such days, they embrace those opportunities that are provided, there being two churches in London employed for that purpose, where they as duly receive the Blessed Sacrament upon all festivals as they perform all the other acts of public worship. How they spend the vigils in preparing their minds for a due celebration of the ensuing solemnity is more private, but not less commendable. And the great care they take to suppress the dawnings of enthusiasm, and to discountenance the first appearances of any vicious practices among their members, and the methods they impose before delinquents are entirely reconciled or totally rejected, is such a preparation of the minds of the laity for the reception of that discipline which is wanted in the Church, that if ever we are blessed with what good men wish and bad men fear, these religious societies will be very instrumental in introducing it, by that happy regulation which prevails among them. And while they pay that deference they profess to their parochial ministers, and are ready to be governed by their directions, and are willing to submit their rules and orders to the judgment of the Reverend the Clergy; I cannot apprehend but that they must be very serviceable to the interest of religion, and may contribute very much to revive that true spirit of Christianity which was so much the glory of the primitive times.'[1]

The 'Societies for *Reformation of Manners*' appear to have been first established about 1691,[2] and to have consisted in great part, though not entirely, of the same persons as the Religious Societies, for the latter were confined to members of the Church of England, which the others were not.[3] Their object was to put down that amount of vice and immorality which had prevailed since the Restoration, by public prosecutions and similar methods; and Queen Mary's Letter to the Justices of Middlesex in that year, as well as King William's Proclamation against Immorality and Profaneness, in 1697, were procured by their means. The Religious Societies had been some years in existence, when those for Reformation were established, as an auxiliary and result of the others. But in the account of them published in 1699, we find the following statement relating to the earlier institutions:—

'Besides those before mentioned (the Societies for Reformation), there are about *nine-and-thirty religious societies* of another kind in and about London and Westminster, which are propagated into other parts of the nation, as Nottingham, Gloucester, &c., and even into Ireland, where they have

[1] Fasts and Festivals, Pref. p. viii. &c.

[2] Account of the Societies for Reformation of Manners, p. 115.

[3] Latterly, however, the Dissenters began to set up a few religious societies after the pattern of those of the Church, but they were always distinct from one another.

S. Clement Danes, at eight o'clock, and a monthly evening lecture on subjects connected with the Holy Eucharist, which was preached by some of those eminent divines whom James endeavoured in vain to induce the bishops to silence. After the Revolution they continued to flourish, and some objections having been made, as was naturally to be expected, to their proceedings, the Bishop of London (Compton) investigated the matter, and was so thoroughly satisfied that he 'dismissed them, with these 'words: "God forbid that I should be against such excellent 'designs."' Others of their chief supporters were 'the Bishop of Gloucester,' Dr. Horneck, and Dr. Jekyl. The Bishop of Gloucester, who was consecrated into the place of the non-juror Bishop Frampton, was Dr. Edward Fowler, who had refused to conform to the Liturgy at the Restoration, but had subsequently changed his mind. But it is possible that the person here intended may have been Richard Willis, Dean of Lincoln, one of the founders of the Gospel Propagation Society, who was made Bishop of Gloucester in 1714.[1] Besides these, there is evidence that these Societies were approved and promoted both by Beveridge, Tillotson, and Stillingfleet.

It was about the year 1691, as before mentioned, that the Societies for Reformation of Manners were founded by the same persons who had before associated for strictly religious purposes. And of these Dr. Woodward records the existence of no less than twenty Associations in London and Westminster at the time he wrote, in addition to forty Religious Societies. He appears to attribute to the impulse thus given to religion, the formation of the Christian Knowledge and Gospel Propagation Societies.[2] He says that the members subscribed

'one hundred pounds towards Dr. Bray's pious intentions of improving the knowledge and practice of the Gospel in our plantations;'[3] and that 'they have been eminently instrumental in setting up about an hundred schools in this city and suburbs, for the instruction of poor children, wherein some thousands of them are now taught freely, and carefully catechised, and educated in good manners and behaviour: many of them are clothed, and in due time placed out to good trades by the same charity.'[4]

Here, then, we seem to have the origin of that admirable system of charity-schools in the Metropolis and elsewhere, carried on by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge for a century before the institution of the National Society. And we cannot help remarking on the hard usage often dealt to the Church of England, both in regard to her missions and her educational labours, by those who judge only from the operations of her more recent Societies. It is as certain as any fact in

[1] The edition from which we quote is dated in 1744. [2] Pp. 73, 74.
[3] Page 98. [4] *Ibid.*

history, that the main design of the founders of the Propagation Society was the conversion of the heathen; yet it is sometimes assumed that the Church made no effort in that cause until the present century. It is equally certain that many thousands of poor children were educated in the schools of the Christian Knowledge Society throughout the whole of the last century, of which fact no notice whatever seems now to be taken.[1]

The success of these endeavours was such, that the Clergy and others were induced to promote similar associations in various parts of the country. A clergyman writes to Dr. Woodward, informing him of the great advantage derived from such an attempt in reforming the manners of his parishioners at Old Romney, in Kent.[2] In connexion with the same movement, monthly meetings of the Clergy themselves were promoted for religious conference, the success of which is particularly mentioned in the counties of Bedford, Nottingham, and Lincoln.[3] In the latter county, the Clergy and others were enabled to put down a long-standing abuse of horse-racing, on some Sundays 'after Lammas,' which had resisted previous efforts, 'as a minister informed the writer from the place,'[4] who may very possibly have been, as we shall see, Samuel Wesley himself. Similar Societies were established also in Ireland, and especially in Dublin, under the sanction of the Archbishop, where there were three hundred persons comprised in ten Societies. At Oxford and Cambridge also, it is mentioned that 'some particular methods, endeavoured by several worthy persons in our Universities, have been very serviceable to religion,' on which the writer adds:—

'And it will always be the prayer of good men, that these ancient and famous nurseries of piety and learning may, by the good discipline and careful conduct of their students, especially those designed for holy orders, ever render themselves renowned in the world. That from them the palaces of princes, the retinue of ambassadors, and the families of noblemen, together with our fleet and foreign factories, may have a continual supply of devout and learned chaplains; and that our parishes, both at home and in our plantations, may thence derive a constant succession of pious and laborious pastors, who may effectually refute error, extirpate vice, recommend piety, and restore the divine honour and authority of our most blessed religion, and that the testimonials of these celebrated seats of learning may everywhere be esteemed as the most sacred credentials of persons of the best characters and accomplishments.'[5]

The first edition of Dr. Woodward's book was translated into German, by Dr. Jablonski, an eminent Lutheran divine,

[1] We have before us the Society's Report for 1773, from which it appears that 49,253 children had been so educated up to that time in London and its suburbs, and that there were then in the schools in London 5,755 children, and in other schools in England and Wales 19,506 boys, and 3,915 girls; in all, 23,421. And this education was not only entirely gratuitous, but many of the children were afterwards apprenticed out to trades.

[2] P. 53. [3] P. 76. [4] P. 20. [5] P. 58.

chaplain to the first king of Prussia and tutor to his son, who was employed also in some endeavours, at that time, to reconcile the Lutheran and Calvinist persuasions, and to unite them under an episcopate to be obtained from the English Church.[1] At Nuremberg, Augsburg, and Ratisbon, similar Societies were established, and at Schaffhausen, in Switzerland; and the celebrated M. Jurieu, and Professor Frank of Halle, wrote in their favour.

It is natural to inquire *what became* of all these Societies—how they came to perish from amongst us, so that their very existence should be almost forgotten. But before we attempt to answer this question, it may be desirable to show what was the nature of the religious meetings which they held, and the Rules by which they were bound.

It was one of their special objects to cultivate—

'The following *ornamental* duties, which are in the sight of God of great price: viz.—

'i. Christian poverty of spirit, in the sense of their own impurity and imperfection.

'ii. A disinterested mind, wholly renouncing all carnal ends.

'iii. Habitual prayer.

'iv. Unfeigned charity towards all men, especially to their souls.

'v. Quiet resignation to the providence of God in all events.'

The Rules of the Society at Poplar are given as follows—except that we slightly abridge them in some parts:—

'i. That the sole design being to promote real holiness of heart and life, it is absolutely necessary that they who enter into it do seriously resolve, by the grace of God, to apply themselves to all means proper to those blessed ends: trusting in the divine power and gracious conduct of the Holy Spirit, through our Lord Jesus Christ, to excite, advance and perfect all good in us.

'ii. That in order to their being *of one heart and one mind* in this design, every member shall own and manifest himself to be of the Church of England, and frequent the Liturgy, &c. And that they be careful withal to express due Christian charity, candour, and moderation towards all such dissenters as are of good conversation.

'iii. That the members shall meet together one evening in the week, in order to encourage each other in practical holiness, by discoursing on such subjects as tend thereto; observing the Holy Scriptures as their rule, and praying to God for His grace and blessing. And to this assembly any serious person, known to any of the Society, may be admitted, upon request.

'iv. That at such meetings they decline all disputes about state affairs, trade and worldly things; and that the whole bent of the discourse be to glorify God and edify one another in love.

'v. Each person to contribute, in his discretion, every weekly meeting, towards pious and charitable uses—especially for putting poor children to school. The money collected to be kept by two stewards chosen annually or oftener, and disbursed by them with consent of the Society, a register being kept which shall be open to any member's inspection.

'vi. Any member may recommend any special object of charity, and special contributions shall be made in extraordinary cases.

---

[1] See Colonial Church Chronicle, vol. v. p. 169.

'vii. Any member absenting himself four meetings successively, without cause assigned, shall be deemed disaffected to the Society.

'viii. The stewards may admit new members, after due inquiry, with consent of a majority; and with the like joint consent they may exclude any member proved guilty of any misbehaviour, after due admonition, unless he gives satisfactory testimony of his repentance and amendment, before the whole Society.

'ix. Recommended to every member to avoid the open scandal of gaming in public-houses, shunning all unnecessary resort to such houses, and wholly avoiding lewd playhouses.

'x. Seriously to endeavour after the practice of the following duties:—1. To be just in all their dealings, to an exemplary strictness. 2. To pray many times a day. 3. To partake of the Lord's Supper at least once a month. 4. To practise the profoundest *meekness* and *humility*. 5. To watch against *censuring* others. 6. Holy thoughts in all places. 7. Help one another. 8. Tenderness, patience, and compassion. 9. In reading the Bible and hearing sermons, to reflect on *themselves*. 10. Shun all foreseen occasions of evil. 11. Think often on the different estates of the *glorified* and the *damned*. 12. Examine themselves every night as to good and evil done. 13. Keep a private fast once a month. 14. Mortify the flesh with its affections and lusts. 15. Advance in heavenly-mindedness. 16. Shun spiritual pride. 17. Pray for the whole Society in private prayers. 18. Read pious books often, but especially the Bible. 19. Be mindful of the great obligation of this *special profession of religion*. 20. Shun all moroseness.

'xi. Be ready, considering the sins of the nation, to do their endeavour towards the punishment of public profaneness.

'xii. Promote catechising of the young and ignorant in their respective families, and observe all family religious duties.

'xiii. Majority bind the rest.

'xiv. Orders to be read over four times a-year.

'xv. Every member shall express his assent to these orders, and keep a copy of them.'

The directions for Religious Conference are to the following effect. 'An orthodox and pious minister,' to be chosen, if possible, as 'Director,' without any salary or reward. (It is not said that he shall be, of necessity, the minister of the parish.) When present he shall conduct the prayers, but in his absence one of the stewards, or any other person, may do so.

After a short exhortation to prayer, he begins with the Collect, 'Prevent us, O Lord,' followed by those for the Second Sunday in Advent, and the Nineteenth Sunday after Trinity. Then all rising from prayer and being seated, the Steward (or it is presumed the Director) may read a chapter, as set forth in one of the orders, or a commentary on Holy Scriptures or on the Catechism, giving time for any who choose to make comments on it, and may appoint any one of forty subjects named, to be discussed in the course of the year, for consideration at the next nference. The subjects have reference to relative and moral ities and devotional acts, with texts subjoined to each. The maining twelve weekly conferences in the year, were to have eference to the Holy Communion.

At the end of the conference was to follow another exhortation

to prayer, followed by the Confession in the Communion Service and the Lord's Prayer. Then the Steward alone was to say the Collect for Ash Wednesday, with that for the day, 'and such other collects in the Common Prayer as may be suitable.' Rising, and saying the Doxology, there was to follow a somewhat lengthy exhortation to the praise of God, and then a Psalm to be sung, the Apostles' Creed recited, after which they were to turn to prayer, beginning with the Collect for Trinity Sunday, with a long prayer for the Society, a general intercession, and a thanksgiving. Another exhortation on the duty of humility, and another Psalm, conclude the exercise; which was to close with the Angels' Hymn and its Preface from the Communion Service, and the Blessing, thus, 'May the grace,' &c.

It is clear, however, that considerable variety was admitted, both in the Rules or Orders of these Societies, and in their religious exercises. This will appear if we compare with the foregoing the following account given us by Bishop Kidder, of the proceedings of those which were under the direction of Dr. Horneck:—

'Certain it is that there were some societies of religious and devout young men, under the Doctor's government and inspection; but whether the Doctor did move these young men at first to enter into such societies, or whether they first applied to him, and he only gave them rules to govern themselves by, I am not able to determine; thus much is certain, that he gave them rules, and they were these that follow:—

'i. That all that entered into such a Society, should enter upon an holy and serious life.

'ii. That no person shall be admitted into this Society till he arrive at the age of sixteen, and hath been first confirmed by the bishop, and solemnly taken on himself his baptismal vow.

'iii. That they choose a minister of the Church of England to direct them.

'iv. That they shall not be allowed, in their meetings, to discourse of any controverted point of divinity.

'v. Neither shall they discourse of the government in Church or State.

'vi. That in their meetings they use no prayers but those of the Church, such as the Litany and Collects, and other prescribed prayers; but still they shall not use any that peculiarly belongs to the minister, as the Absolution.

'vii. That the minister whom they choose, shall direct what practical divinity shall be read at these meetings.

'viii. That they may have liberty, after prayer and reading, to sing a Psalm.

'ix. That after all is done, if there be time left, they may discourse each other about their spiritual concerns; but this shall not be a standing exercise, which any shall be obliged to attend to.

'x. One day in the week to be appointed for the meeting, for such as cannot come on the Lord's-day, and a fine of 3*d.* for unnecessary absence.

'xi. Each to subscribe 6*d.* each time they meet.

'xii. On Whit-Tuesday in each year, two stewards shall be chosen, a moderate dinner provided, and a sermon preached, and the money distributed (charges deducted) to the poor.

'xiii. The orders to be inserted in a book

'xiv. No member admitted without consent of the minister who presides, and no apprentice to be eligible.

'xv. Cases of conscience, if such arise, to be brought before the minister.

'xvi. Those who leave the Society, to pay 5*s.* to the stock.

'xvii. Majority to bind the rest.

'xviii. The following rules are more especially to be commended to the members of this Society: viz.—To love one another. To speak evil of no man. To wrong no man. To pray, if possible, seven times a day. To keep close to the Church of England. To transact all things peaceably and gently. To be helpful to each other. To use themselves to holy thoughts in their coming in and going out. To examine themselves every night. To give every one their due. To obey superiors, both spiritual and temporal.'

The Bishop proceeds to say, that he had himself had occasion to consult a great prelate then living, 1706, probably Tenison, about the establishment of a similar Society, who 'was clearly 'of opinion that the young men were not to be dissuaded, and 'that it was best to take care of them, and secure that zeal 'which they expressed, in the right channel.'

Whether this was not, on the whole, the right conclusion, and whether we are not now reaping the bitter fruits of a contrary decision some years later, is a question of the gravest importance. It is probable that, with our present habits of thought, we shall be disposed to judge this matter, in some degree, according to the opinions we have of the *party* with which the promoters of this scheme may seem to have been connected. But such a judgment would be deceptive, for this reason: Party spirit ran high certainly in those days, perhaps never more so; but it had not yet assumed, at least within the Church, that worst form, of *doctrinal* difference. The questions chiefly agitated were those of ecclesiastical order, and of civil polity as connected with religion—such as the Divine right of kings and bishops; and accordingly, we find many things advocated and enforced with the sanction of such bishops as Tillotson and Tenison, Fuller and Kidder, which would now, alas! be called the extreme of High Church practices. Nor can it be thought that these Societies were confined to any particular party, since it is certain that Beveridge and Stillingfleet were among their promoters,[1] to say nothing of the admirable Dr. Horneck, and Dr. Woodward, as well as Robert Nelson, or of Samuel Wesley, whose name we must next introduce.

Dr. Adam Clarke has given us, at full, a 'Letter concerning the Religious Societies,' written by Samuel Wesley in 1699, and printed, and another Letter from a manuscript of Archbishop Sharpe's on the same subject. The writer of the former, having corrected the error of confounding the Religious Societies with

[1] See Dr. Hook's account of his Life.

those for Reformation of Manners, and explained that the Religious Societies are, by their constitution, wholly confined to members of the Church of England, proceeds to quote Tertullian's description of the way in which the primitive Christians met to exhort one another, to pray and collect alms for the poor, as the best description he can give of these associations. He refers to Dr. Woodward for particulars, and then proceeds thus:—

'I know few good men but lament that, after the destruction of monasteries, there were not some societies founded in their stead, but reformed from their errors, and reduced to the primitive standard. . . . . It will be owned a desirable thing that we had among us some places wherein those who are religiously disposed might have the liberty, for a time, of a voluntary retirement' (quoting the instance of Ferrar in Herbert's Life). 'But if this should not be practicable, at least generally, by men of trade and business, though never so devout inclinations, I see nothing that could come nearer it than these religious societies. The design of Archbishop Cranmer to have founded so many collegiate churches out of the broken monasteries, to consist of some laity, as well as clergy, seems to have had something in it of the same nature (though in a higher degree) with that of these Christian societies now erected; . . . but since we were not so happy as to have this accomplished, why may not these societies in some measure supply the want of them? For if they were once erected in the most considerable towns and villages, or, where one was not large enough, out of more neighbouring villages united, they might be able notably to assist the rural deans, where there are any, and in some measure supply their want where there are none. . . . . There are many parishes which consist of several thousands, some of myriads of souls: now what one man, or two or three, is sufficient for such a multitude? . . . . Those who have but one or two thousand will find their cases heavy enough, especially now they have neither the catechists of the ancients to assist them, nor those clerks which are mentioned in the rubrics, and seem to have been designed for that end, at the Reformation. . . . They would be as so many churchwardens or overseers, or almost deacons under him, caring for the sick and poor, giving him an account of the spiritual estate of themselves and others; persuading parents and sureties to catechise their children, and fitting them for confirmation; discoursing with those who have already left the Church, to bring them back to it, or who are tempted to leave it, in order to preserve them in it; the effect whereof we may guess by the contrary, there being, it is likely, ten who are persuaded to leave the Church by their neighbours, to one who is immediately wrought upon by the dissenting teachers. . . . . The Church of Rome owes, perhaps, her very subsistence, at least most of the progress she has made of late years, to those several societies she nourishes in her bosom: why may we not learn from enemies? and what better way than to fight with their own weapons? . . . Nay, it must be owned there have been some devout persons among them, who, by this very method of forming lesser religious societies in towns and villages, as well as the greater cities, have done great things towards the reformation of manners and promoting piety and virtue' (instancing M. de Renty at Caen, Paris, Toulouse, &c.) . . . 'The design of these societies, as I am satisfied by considering the first founder (Woodward?), and the encouragers of them, and their rules as well as practice, is, by no means to gather churches out of churches, to foment new schisms and divisions, and to make heathens of all the rest of their Christian brethren; which

would be as indefensible in itself as dangerous and fatal in its consequences, both to themselves and others: so far are they from this, that they have brought back several to the Church who were divided from it; but their aim is purely and only to promote, in a regular manner, that which is the end of every Christian, the glory of God, included in the welfare and salvation of themselves and their neighbours.'

The writer concludes by recommending also the Societies for Reformation, referring to the Bishop of Gloucester (Fowler)'s defence of them, and quoting some words of the then Archbishop (Tenison) in their favour.[1]

Our space forbids any lengthened extracts from Archbishop Sharpe's letter on the opposite side. It is clear that it is not addressed, as Dr. Clarke says some had supposed,[2] to Samuel Wesley, as it is plainly a reply to some official of the Bishop of Carlisle, who had consulted him on the subject. But it is but fair to extract the following passage:—

'I myself have always been averse to such sort of confederacies or combinations, whether of clergy or others, as are now on foot everywhere, whether they be those called religious societies, or those of a later standing which go under the name of societies for reformation,[3] as doubting whether they be legal in themselves, (though, with submission, I think it may bear a dispute whether they come under those conventicles that are forbid in the 12th and 73d canons,) and apprehending likewise that some time or other we may feel ill consequences from them.'[4]

This objection from the Canons was answered by Nelson, as follows:[5]—

'As for those objections which are urged against these societies from some canons of the Church (12th and 73d), they seem to be founded upon a misunderstanding of the sense of those canons, the first whereof was designed against the pernicious opinions of the Anabaptists, and the latter only against such meetings and consultations as tended to the impeaching the doctrine of the Church of England, &c., neither of which consequences can justly be charged upon a body of men who make it a chief qualification in the electing their members, that they be such as own and manifest themselves to be of the Church of England, and frequent the public holy exercises of the same.'

But it will be seen that we are far from advocating, in our day, *such* meetings as those which have been described. And here it may be worth while to advert to an attempt which was made by an indvidual clergyman, at the very time to which we refer, to alter the public services of the Church at his pleasure, and on his own responsibility alone. He describes himself in his books as 'Mr. Edward Stephens, sometime Barrister-at-Law of 'the Middle Temple, and since engaged by a very special Divine

[1] Adam Clarke's Lives of the Wesleys, vol. i. pp. 144, 145. [2] *Ibid.* p. 154.
[3] These last were some time after declared illegal by a Court of Justice; and it is not difficult to see that there must be a great difference between such associations and a mere religious society.
[4] Lives of the Wesleys, i. 155. [5] Fasts and Festivals, Preface, p. xi.

'Providence in the most sacred employment.'[1] And it appears from several parts of his book that he began, in early life, by persuading a clergyman in the country (soon after the Restoration) to have monthly communion, 'which was rarely then any 'where else in the nation above once or twice, or thrice at most, 'in the year.'[2] Afterwards, in a parish where he was lord of the manor and patron, he got it celebrated weekly; and next, removing to London, persuaded some priests—and among them one who had been ordained, but had joined the dissenters, from whence he had reclaimed him—to attend with him weekly at S. Laurence's; and next, to set up a *daily* celebration in a private house, at which this person, on the ground of his previous orders, officiated in a form altered by Stephens from the English office, on what he conceived the model of the primitive Liturgies. When their chaplain was removed from them, rather than the practice should be lost, he took orders himself, though by whom ordained he does not say; and was allowed the use successively of three different churches in London, at which he daily celebrated the divine mysteries for some considerable time. The last of these churches he mentions as *S. Matthew's*, (Friday Street?) in the heart of the City, and it is perhaps the same as that for the use of which he elsewhere says he was indebted to the Bishop of Gloucester (Fowler, who had been a Nonconformist). Here he continued between two and three years, and had seldom less than thirty communicants daily, and on the Lord's day and Festivals a 'considerable number;' until his numbers falling off, and his proceedings exciting opposition, he gave it up, and retired into the country.

Had this been all, we might have supposed that this well-intentioned man had exhibited a model of primitive doctrine, worthy of respectful consideration, if not of imitation. But it further appears that he was not content with this, without introducing his innovations upon the authorized Communion Office, even into the Church where he officiated; first, by adopting some interpolations and transpositions of his own; and next, by using, with some variations, the service from the Scottish Book. From this he proceeded to other extravagancies; and probably after his retirement, continued to write tracts of the most violent kind, against the Reformation and against the then constituted order of things in Church and State, inveighing especially against Cranmer as the author of all evil in the Church, and disputing the validity of the English Orders. It is

[1] A collection of Tracts and Papers, most of them presented to the Lower House of Convocation. London. 1702. 'Socrates Christianus' is contained in this volume.

[2] Second Apology of 'Socrates Christianus,' p. 4.

singular that he never mentions the Non-jurors, and does not seem to have held any communion with them. He sought communion with the Church in France, and with the Greek Church, but in terms inadmissible by them, refusing to submit to the authority or doctrines of either, but claiming to be received on the general ground of an 'English Catholic.' As for the defect of his authority as an English priest, to attempt such innovations, he pleaded just as Wesley did, that the 'defect in ordinary conveyance was supplied by that which was 'extraordinary. Is God's hand shortened?' and the like. At this time, he seems to have thought himself called to found a new Sect, or be the originator of a great revival of religion; and it was probably not till afterwards, when his hopes were frustrated, that he indulged in those vehement invectives against everything connected with religion in England, which led to its being reported that he was mad. There is no evidence to support the latter assertion; but there was that want of judgment, or impatience of opposition to his own views, which has so often frustrated the best intentions, and rendered good designs abortive. It appears that, at one time, his daily communion was frequented by the members of one of the religious societies in London, but they quitted him on account of his introducing prayers for the dead into his Communion Office. On this he published a violent letter to one of their members, in which he says, 'It is not I, but you, who have made a separation,' and proceeds to prove the early introduction of such petitions into the Liturgical Offices, without the least reference to the question of an individual priest's restoring them on his own mere will, in opposition to the law of the Church, and without sanction from the bishop.

Another of his schemes was for a Society of Religious Women, to be maintained in common, and to devote themselves to the daily public service of God, and to works of piety and charity, as nurses in hospitals and in similar ways. He speaks also with considerable severity of the poor success Dr. Bray's proposal had as yet met with, hardly having raised three thousand pounds for the Propagation of the Gospel; and with some irony reproaches this 'best reformed Church' with the number of souls she has lost or left to perish. On the whole, we would recommend this rare and curious volume to the perusal of those who may have access to it, as opening a forgotten page in the development of the Church after the Revolution, and affording some ground for sad reflections, and some perhaps for warning.

Pass we on now to the year 1729, and let the scene be at

[1] The copy we have referred to belongs to Sion College; it is a presentation copy, and it is kept in the Archives.

Oxford. Bearing in mind the aspiration of Woodward before referred to, for the establishment of Religious Societies at our Universities, and what do we find? John Wesley, elected Fellow of Lincoln in 1726, ordained Priest in 1728, returns to college from a visit to his father in Lincolnshire in 1729, and finds a Religious Society already established by his brother Charles, Mr. Morgan, and some others. He joins them, and they are hooted for going to weekly communion and other singularities, such especially as visiting the prisoners in the Castle. He writes to his father for advice, who replies, on September 28, 1730:—

'As to your designs and employments, what can I say less of you than *Valde probo:* and that I have the highest reason to bless God that He has given me two sons together in Oxford to whom He has given grace and courage to turn the war against the world and the devil, which is the best way to answer them.... Go on, then, in God's name, in the path to which your Saviour has directed you, and that track wherein your father has gone before you; for when I was an undergraduate at Oxford, I visited those in the Castle there, and reflect on it with great satisfaction. Walk as prudently as you can, though not fearfully, and my heart and prayers are with you.'

He advises them also to obtain 'the direction and approbation of their bishop.' This was at that time Dr. Potter, afterwards archbishop. He had been chaplain to Tillotson, and as he could not but know of that prelate's approval of the Religious Societies, it was only natural that he should give, as he did, the sanction which was sought.

And now, can there exist a doubt as to the direct connexion between these Religious Societies and those which were established by Wesley and his brother? If it be asked how it came that Wesley himself should not have referred them to this origin, that question may be answered by another. How came it that he never referred to the fact of the establishment of such a society at Oxford by his brother and others before his return, in his absence? Whether he thought such matters unimportant, or whether he indulged an unconscious reluctance to admit a competitor in the great scheme of which he is certainly entitled to be called the founder, the answer to either question is the same. And we venture to think that no reasonable doubt can remain of the connexion which we have thus endeavoured to establish.[1]

But clouds were now settling fast upon the Church of England. The violence of party spirit on the one hand, and of arbitrary power on the other, had well-nigh done their work. The good and even great men who, having been trained in other

[1] There is extant among his works a sermon preached by John Wesley before the 'Reformation' Societies.

days, were appointed by the government of the Revolution to the highest places, were passing off the scene. But the practice then first introduced, of selecting bishops for political services without consulting the episcopal order, survived the occasion, and was abused accordingly. Convocation was permanently silenced, because it would not tamely endure the promotion of a heretic. And when the Wesleyan movement was becoming dangerous to the Church, the Metropolitan was Dr. Herring, no otherwise famous than for having been translated from York to Canterbury, and for having committed, in regard to Wesley, precisely the same error which had been committed by Leo X. in regard to Luther. For in his published correspondence he has been so unfortunate as to express the opinion that 'Wesley was a man who would make few converts.' How different from Wesley's own estimate of his system, in these winged words addressed to Bishop Gibson,—'All the minister of God asks is, δὸς ποῦ στῶ καὶ γῆν κινήσω.'[1] And so that system has been left to work its way, with what results it is more easy now to see, than it is to forecast its eventual tendency.[2]

The question is, Can nothing now be done to arrest or mitigate the evil? For an evil undoubtedly it is (even though it be true that in some instances piety is thus promoted), that so large a portion of those who ought to constitute the very sinews of the Church should be either wholly alienated from us, or brought into a state of doubtful and precarious connexion. In towns, we fear the alienation is general. In the country it is not as yet so. But here, in those parts where Methodism prevails, the almost universal feeling among the poor is, that to become religious and to join the Wesleyan Societies is the same thing. And the consequence is, that the Church has all the discredit of the lukewarm and the vicious; but from the time that any have become more seriously impressed, they begin to stray after the Classes and the Fellowship meetings, which are so attractive to persons in that state of mind and with that amount of information.

It will be said, 'You must educate them;' and we say the same. But there are few delusions greater than that so common one, that what we now dignify with the name of education will be in itself sufficient when the temptation comes. We labour hard to get some knowledge into the minds of boys, who leave us at twelve years old, before the time that thought has begun to operate. If we keep a few of them some two or three years longer at the

[1] Letter to Bishop of London. Works, vol. viii. p. 494.

[2] Not that we mean to say for a moment that the rules could be construed to justify or sanction such innovations as were introduced by Wesley. See his Works, viii. pp. 269—272.

Sunday-school, too many of these will show us, as soon as they have the liberty, that they have considered going to church as a part of school work, and quickly leave it off. They go out to service in other parishes where they are not known, are much employed on the Lord's day, and with every passion coming into play, soon leave off even private prayer, and laugh at all that we have taught them to revere. But they have heard much of the corruption of their own nature, and of the necessity of divine grace; and thinking that as yet no such grace is theirs, they give way to their own unbridled passions, believing it to be their inevitable lot, until they shall be 'called.' And then, when this call shall come, the Wesleyan Societies are ready to receive them; and as for going to their Parish Priest to open their grief or ask advice or confess their misery, they have never heard of its being done, and they never think of doing it.

In order to suggest a possible remedy for this state of things, we are enabled here to produce a set of 'Rules for a Church of England Religious Society,' which were drawn up fifteen years ago, and which we are further enabled to state that a late wise and cautious Bishop, who then presided over the diocese in which it was intended to make the experiment, had kindly promised to ratify with his signature. Why the attempt did not then proceed is no further important than as it may be necessary to state, that it depended entirely on private circumstances no way connected with the merits of the attempt itself. We omit a short preface which preceded them, but we give the Rules entire:—

'RULE I. *Members.*—The test of membership shall be, that each person comply with the eighth Rubric at the end of the Office for the Communion, which enjoins, that "every parishioner shall communicate at least three times a-year, of which Easter to be one." [The word Easter being understood to extend to seven days after Easter Sunday, as limited in the Rubric to the proper preface for Easter-day, in the Communion Service.]

'II. *Probationary Members.*—§ 1. After the first establishment of the Society, no person shall be admitted a member who shall not have been proposed by two members, and who shall not have complied with the whole of the rules for the space of one whole year after having been so proposed. But on the first anniversary, persons may be admitted after half a year of probation. Young persons after Confirmation desiring to be members, and being proposed as above, shall in like manner be admitted as probationary members, for the like space of one year. And it is desirable that they be proposed by their sponsors, being members of the Society.

'§ 2. When any probationary member is proposed, the members proposing him or her shall certify to the minister the name of such person, together with their belief that he or she is piously and devoutly disposed, according to the baptismal vow, to lead a godly and a Christian life; and such person coming to the minister before the next Communion, and giving satisfaction to him of his or her fitness to come to the Lord's Table, shall be admitted a probationary member.

'§ 3. Persons who may have ceased to be members, may be re-admitted

as probationary members, in the same way as those who never have been members.

'III. *Holy Communion.*—§ 1. All members shall be bound to comply with the first Rubric before the Office for the Communion, which requires that "so many as intend to be partakers of the Holy Communion, shall signify their names to the Curate (that is, to the minister) at least some time the day before." But if they are not able to quiet their conscience, the Church exhorts them to open their grief either to their own or to some other discreet and learned minister of God's word. [Exhortation in the Communion Service.]

'§ 2. Any member who shall be aware that any other member has transgressed the bounds set down in the second and third Rubric before the Office for the Communion, by any notorious sin, or by doing any wrong to his neighbour, or by living at variance with his neighbour, shall be bound to exhort such person to confess his sin to the minister when he next comes to signify to him his intention to partake of the Holy Communion, and if he refuse or neglect to do so, such member shall himself tell it to the minister, who thus "having knowledge thereof, shall advertise him that he presume not to come to the Lord's Table until he hath openly declared himself to have truly repented and amended;" which declaration shall be made to the Society by himself or through the minister. But if he refuse, the minister shall signify to the Society that such person hath not complied with the rules of the Society, by which non-compliance he hath ceased to be a member, and his name shall be struck off the list accordingly. [S. Matt. xviii. 15—17.]

'§ 3. Masters or mistresses of families, being members, shall exhort their household to partake of the Holy Communion, and shall signify to the minister the names of such as are willing to communicate.

'IV. *Holy Baptism.*—§ 1. Members shall in no case procure their children to be baptized at their own houses, "unless upon great and reasonable cause to be approved by the Curate" (that is, the minister). Nor, without like cause, shall they defer the baptism of their children "beyond the first or second Sunday next after their birth, or some holy-day falling between." [See the 1st and 2d Rubrics before the Office for Private Baptism.]

'§ 2. They shall provide for every male child to be baptized two godfathers and one godmother, and for every female child one godfather and two godmothers, *who shall be communicants of the Church.* It is expected that members shall be ready to undertake this charitable office for the children of their neighbours, whether members of the Society or not.

'§ 3. Members, being "parents, masters, or mistresses, shall cause their children and servants to come to the church (or school) at the time appointed, and obediently to hear and be ordered by the Curate," in the Catechism and other instruction which he shall give them. [See Rubric at the end of Church Catechism.]

'V. *Lord's Day.*—§ 1. Members shall stand pledged to keep holy the Lord's day. They shall attend the full services of their parish church, or show cause to the contrary to the satisfaction of the Society. They shall promote the like attendance on the part of their children and servants, and shall employ themselves in training them in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, and in other charitable works.

'§ 2. Any member not showing cause for absence from church to the satisfaction of the Society, shall be admonished thereof by the minister, when he next presents himself for the Holy Communion, (but will not, therefore, be excluded from the Lord's Table.) After having been thrice admonished within the year, such person shall cease to be a member of the Society.

'VI. *Sickness.*—"When any person (being a member) is sick, notice shall be given thereof to the minister of the parish," that he may receive the consolations of the Church. [See Rubric for the Visitation of the Sick.] If the Lord's Supper be administered to him, he shall procure the fit number to communicate with, (namely, three, or two at the least.) He shall also ask for the public prayers of the congregation in church, and shall not fail to return public thanks, as well for any other signal mercy, as for recovery from dangerous sickness. Members shall exhort their sick brethren, not being members, to send for their minister, and shall be ready, of their charity, to read to them and instruct them, and, if required, to communicate with them. N.B. Sick persons are to be moved "to make special confession of their sins, if they feel their conscience burdened with any weighty matter." [Rubric for the Visitation of the Sick.]

'VII. *Family Prayers.*—Heads of families, being members, shall have family prayers night and morning; or if they go to daily work, yet at the least every night. And their minister shall, at their desire, supply them with a form for that purpose. They shall not omit to pray for a blessing on this Society, on their bishop, and their minister.

'VIII. *Stewards and Church Collection.*—§ 1. "Upon the first day of the week" (namely, the Lord's day) "let every member lay by him in store as God hath prospered him" [1 Cor. xvi. 2] some contribution, however small, for sick and poor members, which shall be collected by the stewards after divine service, when there is no church collection.

'§ 2. Two stewards shall be chosen yearly at the anniversary of the Society. But if the churchwardens of the parish be members, or either of them, he or they shall be stewards by virtue of their office, and then only one other steward shall be chosen, [according to the Rubric, which says that "the alms of the people shall be collected by the churchwardens, or other fit persons."] They shall be the treasurers of the Society, and the collection shall be administered by them together with the minister, setting apart for missionary purposes such proportion of it as shall be fixed at the anniversary meeting. The benefits of the collection shall not be confined to members.

'§ 3. The stewards shall also keep a list of members; they shall note on every Lord's day, after divine service, such members as have not complied with the rules of the Society, and shall signify the same to the minister, who shall adopt the same course in every other case as is provided by Rule V. The members shall assemble for these purposes after divine service, in the vestry or chancel, or other convenient place.

'IX. *Certificates.*—Any person coming into the parish from any other parish where there is a Church society, and bringing with him a certificate of membership, signed by the minister, shall be at once admitted a full member of this Society, on his signing the Rules. And any member quitting the parish may take with him a certificate to the same effect, or to the effect of his being a communicant of the Church.

'X. *Anniversary.*—On Whit-Monday or Whit-Tuesday, or on some other Holy-day of the Church, the anniversary of the Society shall be held, when every member shall attend the full service of the Church, morning and afternoon; and shall partake of the communion of the Body and Blood of Christ. After service, probationary members shall be admitted to membership: the names of fresh probationary members shall be given in by their sponsors or two other members: the surplus of the collection shall be allotted by vote to missionary purposes, or to the bishop to be distributed by him. Stewards shall be elected, and other business transacted.

'XI.—This Society shall not be established until the Rules shall have been submitted to the bishop, and approved by him (according to the primitive

injunction "to do nothing apart from the bishop"). Each member shall sign the Rules and keep a copy of them. Nor shall they be altered, except with consent of the bishop, and of two-thirds of the members. If any dispute arise about the Rules, it shall be referred to the bishop, and his award shall be final. The bishop shall have the power, at his pleasure, to *dissolve* the Society.

'XII. *Church-Membership.*—Forasmuch as it is declared by the Articles of the Church of England, that "the visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance" [Article xix.]; and again, that "the Church hath power to decree rites or ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith" [Article xx.]; it is therefore a fundamental rule of this Society, that it does not seek to form any new association, apart from that "congregation of faithful men," of which the Church consists; and that the members do no more than pledge themselves to observe those things which they are already bound to observe by their Baptism and Christian profession, renewed in Confirmation and in the Supper of the Lord.'

It will be seen that it was not intended under these Rules to hold any devotional meetings except in church. But this is not the only deviation from the design of the original Religious Societies. Those Societies were associations of 'young men' only; and although Dr. Woodward remarks, in reply to objections on that score, that they had existed long enough for some of the members to attain the age of sixty, the principle involved in them was that they should be confined to young men. And if only so much as this were now to be attempted, we believe much good might result.

Perhaps the rule might be that young men should be admitted after confirmation until the age of thirty, after which age they should be 'honorary members,' not being obliged to submit to the calling of their names, but being of course partakers of all the privileges of the Society. As the Rules prescribe nothing which is not already prescribed by the Church, it might be presumed that by that time they would have got the habit of observing those ordinances—and this would be one safeguard against the danger of the Society degenerating into a sect. For the same and for other reasons it might be better not to admit young women at all. Religion has more hold upon the female mind, and if that degree of discipline which the Church prescribes once came to be generally understood, there would be little fear of their gentle nature not falling earnestly into the system adopted by their husbands and brothers.

But on the other hand it is not conceivable that such a Society should flourish without *some sort* of religious meetings. It is provided in the above Rules that the members shall assemble after Divine service in the Vestry or Chancel, when their names shall be called and the collection made. Would it be possible to connect with this the practice of saying *private*

prayers in common at the altar rails, or elsewhere, according to the course so often recommended of late, though hitherto with small success? We remember to have seen many years ago, in the Cathedral at Turin, a number of men of the middle rank in life kneeling together at the rails of a side altar, where no service was going on, no priest being present, and reciting in common a series of prayers in a plain tone. We believe they were the members of one of those charitable fraternities to which, as Samuel Wesley truly said, 'the Church of Rome owes so much.' Whether it might ever be thought fit to allow a number of collects from the Prayer-book to be thus recited in common in our churches, is a question for the rulers of the Church; and what may be the precise intention of the Bishop of Llandaff in the Committee of Convocation appointed on his suggestion, we do not know. But we will suggest another mode, which we think is practicable even now. The bishop has authority to permit the use of the Litany at other times than those prescribed. And that this power is deemed to extend to all hours of the day, and is not limited by the words, 'after morning prayer,' appears from the fact of its having long been the practice at Lambeth to have the Litany in the Archbishop's Chapel, when the Bishops dine with his Grace, and on other public occasions, before they go to dinner. Indeed it is wisely done to construe such permission as widely as the words will bear. We would therefore suggest that the Litany should be used at an evening service; and, if there was a village choir, it might be said or sung in the chancel with the choir. After this a psalm might follow, and then a lecture. After the prayer preceding the lecture, it might be permitted that all should kneel in silence for some minutes, and then join aloud in the Lord's Prayer. We should be inclined to hope that this might supply a sufficient substitute for those exciting prayer-meetings in which it is said that each in turn is permitted to lead the devotions of the rest, according to the impulse of the moment. After the lecture, it would be competent to use any number of the collects in the end of the Office for the Holy Communion, according to the permission of the rubric. Of course it is not intended that these meetings should be confined to those who should form the Society, but be open to all comers, like all other services in church. We believe there is, at least, one instance in London in which the Bishop allows the Litany to be used daily in Holy Week; and in which, whit such permission, the following services were tried at that season in the present year: 1, Morning Prayer, early; 2, at the midday office, the seven penitential Psalms, the Litany, the office for the day in the Holy Communion; 3, Evensong, with sermon.

If it should be feared that even so much as this might lead eventually to division and sectarianism, the answer is that sectarianism and division exist already, and that the meetings of those among whom they exist are of a far more questionable kind than these would ever be; so that such proposals are not to be considered as if no such thing existed, but rather as a kind of *ecclesiastical homœopathy.*

We see and have experienced the way by which those who at least began as the most devoted members of the Church have been led into separation. Does not this fact indicate its own cure? Does it not indicate a want which is not supplied, a craving which is not satisfied, within the pall of our communion? And are we always to go on boasting of our exemption from what we stigmatise as enthusiasm, when the result is, not that enthusiasm is diminished—quite the contrary—but that those deep and often excited feelings which, under proper regulation, might be capable of the best results, are led to find their vent in unauthorized and schismatical courses because they can find no sympathy, or at least no bond of union and fellowship, where they first arise? For it is this that aggravates the evil, that these people are our own people, and that they often receive their first and most abiding religious impressions within the Church.

We hear much of proposals for influencing the masses of our people, and bringing them back to the Church. We have ourselves, in a recent article, suggested the possibility of preaching in the open air, and of a modified and regulated system of itinerancy. But we are satisfied that this will not do alone. Why is it that the preaching of Whitfield has left no abiding results, while that of Wesley has laid the foundation of such a vast and increasing fabric? We know of no other reason than this, that the one preacher combined his followers into a Religious Society, while the other was content with the transient impression on individual minds. And we may learn the same thing from our own Missions among the heathen. Bishop Middleton has left behind him this emphatic declaration in regard to Missions, that 'the progress of the Gospel in India is 'opposed by discipline and system; and by discipline and system 'alone, with the Divine Blessing, can it ever make its way.' And all experience verifies the correctness of his opinion, so much so that our Missionaries are constrained to have services and meetings which we at home should deem irregular. And et if their converts are liable to the allurements of their former eathenism, who shall say that the allurement in their case is reater than that to which those are subject, who, in addition o the temptations of the world, the flesh and the devil, are

liable to all the enticements of a prevalent, and to them attractive system of religious excitement? We are far from saying that their *danger* is so great, since we desire to speak with all charity of those whose error we believe to be one, for the most part, of the information or judgment rather than of the will. But we think that the masses of our people have less to guard them against schism than our heathen converts have to protect them against relapsing into heathenism.

And here another matter presents itself. We have spoken of Wesleyan Methodism, because it is that which offers the most obvious point of disunion with the Church, being at once the most recent, and having the fewest points of essential difference. But we believe what we are about to mention would extend to all classes of Dissenters. *Are we to go on for ever without any attempt at reconciliation?* No, says the liberal spirit now in vogue — alter your Prayer-book, relax your Articles, strike out all that now offends, and by merging 'minor differences' place the Church of the Nation once more on the broad basis of national acceptance. Alas, too glowing picture, —alas, how hopeless and impracticable! The experiment has before been tried, and failed as it must ever fail, but left behind it a legacy of bitterness from which, now in a century and a half, we have not yet recovered. It was shown by the elder Sherlock, in a tract published by him at the time, in 1689,[1] that the Church neither desired these alterations nor needed them, and that if made for the sake of Dissenters they would not and could not satisfy them, but that, if made, that which they would do would be this, *they would make a schism within the Church.*

What then can be done? We think it would be a right course, and one which would tend to good, and open a way at least towards future reconciliation, if Convocation might be permitted to enter upon communications with the Wesleyan Conference, and with the governing body of other 'denominations,' expressive of the desire on the part of the Church for mutual reconciliation on the ground of mutual forgiveness, and inquiring what concessions could now be made by which they would be satisfied. It is indeed not conceivable that any concessions which we could make would effect an immediate reconciliation with the original Dissenters. Such a dream was shown by Doctor Sherlock to be hopeless at the time of that commission, whose proposals are now to be printed with the sanction of the House of Commons. For their congregations would not join us without their ministers, and their ministers would not

[1] A Letter to a Friend, containing some queries about the new Commission for making alterations in the Liturgy, Canons, &c. of the Church of England.

submit to Episcopal ordination. Nor is it our intention to propose concessions. Everything in the way of charitable and affectionate intercourse—every expression of regret for former differences, which could be made consistently with the maintenance of our own position as the visible Church in England—we would gladly recommend. Above all, we would submit to any amount of self-humiliation and self-accusation, on the ground of our manifold sins. But as regards concessions, we believe there is considerable doubt whether the common report of Archbishop Bramhall's having admitted Presbyterian Ministers to *conditional* ordination is correct. Dr. Hook, in his Life, says that he ordained them in the usual form of ordaining laymen, without any hypothesis, and merely inserted a clause in their letters of orders, to certify that he did it to supply defects.

But we think that such overtures, even as regards them, would be graceful and in good taste, and might pave the way for future reconciliation by healing old animosities. They might do more; and that we may be honest as to our intentions, we will not scruple to avow them. We think it not impossible that, in this way, we might by degrees attract many of their body to *submit* to the claims of the Church, and thus allure the best of them into the stream of our influence. We hear that this is what is now being done, to a very great extent, by the Church in America. And in proportion as we show ourselves equal to our own pretensions, and to the greatness of our vocation, why should it not be hoped that the same result may follow among ourselves? And in regard to the Wesleyan body, we think we might hope for more. We have reason to believe that the old yearning after the Church which Wesley longed to serve, is not yet extinct among them, and that a considerable number of their ministers would accept orders from our bishops without any concession on our part. At least it is worth while to make the attempt; and if made in a friendly spirit, and without an attempt, always so fatal, on the part of the State, to coerce us into concessions which we ought not to make, for the sake of its own chimerical and impracticable schemes, it might have some good effect, especially at a time when that body itself is agitated by internal disunion. At all events we think it cannot be denied that some such overture ought to have been made long ago, and if it be now more difficult it is never too late to do right.[1]

[1] Having turned to Dr. Hook's Life of Wesley in his Ecclesiastical Biography, r this was written, and just as we were sending it to the press, we find that he there ventured even to suggest that the existing system of the Wesleyans uld be licensed by the Church, on their agreeing, of course, to a reconciliation. are happy to refer to this eminent authority in support of the opinions we ve expressed.

But that on which we mean chiefly to insist is, that the great cause of increased dissent in modern times is *the want of an organized system of voluntary discipline* within the Church. Whether the means of restoring such a system which we have here ventured to suggest would be effectual or not, we must now leave to others to decide. But if not, we still maintain that we cannot hope to succeed in retaining within our communion the whole body of those whom we educate, or whom we reclaim from ignorance and vice, until we shall have found out some way of supplying to them those incentives to devotion, and that scope and vent to the outpourings of awakened hearts, which we are thankful to believe are indeed now supplied, to some extent, to the educated and intellectual classes, but which require to be extended to all those to whom the Gospel ought to be all in all.

[Since the above was written, we have found it stated in the authorized Life of Wesley by Dr. Cook, that *the Religious Societies in the Church of England received him with open arms*,—a statement which confirms all our surmises on the subject.][1]

---

[1] 'The Societies for the Reformation of Manners, which received the support of the Government (!), and the *private Societies* formed throughout the kingdom by the zeal and strong recommendation of the pious Doctor *Horneck* and others, undoubtedly gave a check to that dissipation of spirit, that practical Atheism, and that perfect looseness of morals, which had so entirely pervaded the whole land. Many of these Societies remained in being in the year 1738, and received Mr. Wesley with open arms when he entered on his most extensive sphere of action.' —Cook and Moore's Life of Wesley, pp. 6, 7. 1792.

ART. VII.—*Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the existing state of the Corporation of the City of London, and to collect information respecting its Constitution, Order and Government, &c., together with the Minutes of Evidence and Appendix. Presented to the Houses of Parliament by command of Her Majesty.* Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1854; fol. pp. 913.

IN the year 1853 it had become clear that it was impossible any longer to resist a searching inquiry into the affairs of the Corporation of London; and such an inquiry it was evident would result in suggestions for its comprehensive reform. There is nothing either wonderful or blameable in the fact that it had stood unreformed so long; and that great tenderness and consideration were evinced for so many years towards the privileges and administration of the Corporation. It is, perhaps, a more legitimate subject of surprise that the issuing of the commission of inquiry excited so little opposition, and that the recommendations of the commissioners, important and sweeping as they are in their character and scope, should have occasioned so little unfavourable comment.

For, in truth, the ancient history of the Corporation is one which, upon the whole, may be regarded with justifiable pride and satisfaction. Its present immense wealth, and consequent political power, are the legitimate results of an early history, creditable to themselves, and to the national institutions and character, of which they were a chief production and example. Wealth has brought with it corruption; exclusiveness and selfish policy have naturally engendered weakness; and the existing Corporation of London has become the reproach of this practical and economical country, and has been the object of obloquy, perhaps a little exaggerated, and of attacks certainly somewhat ill-directed. The history, however, for many centuries of corporate cities in general, and emphatically that of London itself, is by no means a subject for either obloquy or attack. They were the sole homes of freedom in Europe, the only places of refuge from the tyranny and oppression of the sovereign and his armed nobility. Great and wise kings, in almost every European country, seem to have felt the absolute necessity of creating and protecting the liberties of these incorporated towns; perhaps as some mitigation of feudal rigours, possibly also from the selfish yet politic desire of finding some support for them-

selves against the overwhelming power which the barons could exert even in England if united, and which in foreign countries was often possessed by a single great feudatory. It is likely enough that on the part of the cities, privileges were often extorted from very mixed motives, and that it was but seldom that an enlightened policy or a wise prescience dictated demands which, in their result, turned out highly valuable and salutary to the community at large. Still, happily, the instincts of the cities were generally to be trusted; even if these anti-feudal and anti-baronial feelings may have been carried in some cases to excess, it was the right feeling for the times, its encouragement was the encouragement of art, and commerce, and education, and independence; it was the spirit which has made England one of the greatest empires of which history takes note, and certainly the freest country in the world. We can understand, perhaps sympathise with, the indignation of a baron who had lost his Gurth or Wamba, and who found that he had fled, very likely had been enticed, into the City of London, had been concealed there for a year and a day, and had now become a free citizen, entitled to snap his fingers at his lord. But this was one of the ways through which feudal slavery was first mitigated, and gradually disappeared; and no one who reads the middle age Chroniclers will be apt to think hardly of any means, however indirect, which raised the value of the lower classes in the eyes of their superiors, or pointed out to the serfs and vassals a way for their escape from under those iron footsteps which trod them heedlessly into the dust, and crushed their very lives out with contemptuous disregard. There is nothing so painful in perusing records of the 'age of chivalry,' as the utter scorn and cruel selfishness of the gentlemen of those days towards all below, or out of the pale of their own chosen class. The sneers of Horace, and the remorseless exterminations of Sulla, are hardly more indefensible in principle than the tone in which Froissart records the massacre of a multitude of common people, or the defeat and death of Philip van Artevelde.

Against this spirit it was a matter of course that the City of London should struggle; and it had power, as far as its own interests were concerned, to struggle successfully. Even before the Norman conquest, London had asserted its independence, and its right to be governed internally by its own laws; and was certainly not at that time, nor for some time previously, *in demesne* like so many other cities. The citizens obtained from the respect or fear of the Conqueror, who might have heard of their inflexible and successful resistance to the great Canute, brief but pregnant charters, which in effect confirmed them in the enjoyment of all their essential privileges; exempting them in

particular from the hated jurisdiction of the king's justiciars, who were imposed upon the rest of the kingdom as foreign judges, administering an alien system of justice in a language which the people did not understand. In the time of Stephen, and again in the reign of John, they contended with vigour and success against the harsh despotism of the Empress Matilda, and the meaner tyranny of the king; and although they suffered often and greatly during the long and troubled reign of Henry III., their power and splendour on the whole greatly increased, and at the same time their authority in the country (sufficient more than once to decide the issue of a civil war), and their determination to maintain their freedom. They even ventured into conflict with so great a sovereign as Edward I.; and although they had sometimes to buy their privileges of him at a heavy rate, they did buy them, and boldly defied the king when he attempted to invade them. In the time of Richard II. the feeling of the citizens for freedom, but for freedom regulated by law, was notably displayed. They resisted Wat Tyler and his 100,000 men, and the lord mayor killed him: but they could not tolerate the wanton oppressions of the king; and their hearty adhesion to the cause of Henry IV. seated the house of Lancaster on the throne. They uniformly supported this politic king in his contests with his barons; on one occasion almost alone defeating a powerful combination of the discontented nobility. The wars of the Roses afforded many opportunities, not neglected by the citizens of London, for increasing their own privileges; and as they had been found on the side of Henry IV. against Richard II., so on the other hand they were steadily in favour of the house of York, throughout all the contests of the reign of Henry VI. Thrice did Edward IV. owe his crown to the citizens of London. He repaid them with lavish grants, with genial and steady patronage. Their support deserved his gratitude, and although, as we have suggested, it is likely enough that selfish motives mingled with nobler ones in directing their policy, so it was, that the kings who trusted most to their parliaments, appealed most to their people, curbed most vigorously the turbulence of their barons, met with the firmest and most powerful support at their hands.

An imperious and high-handed race of kings followed upon the brief usurpation of Richard III., who himself almost professed to base his claims to the crown upon an election by the city. Under the Tudors, the City of London, like the rest of England, abated somewhat of its free and haughty spirit. Yet glimpses of the old temper flashed forth from time to time. The city withstood Wolsey and Henry VIII., and absolutely refused to comply with an illegal tax; and Mary owed the complete defeat

of Sir Thomas Wyatt's insurrection to the loyalty and courage of the citizens. Elizabeth treated the city like the rest of her subjects; if she somewhat strained her authority, her people submitted to it in general because they knew that it was not for selfish or unworthy ends; but when once she attempted to take into her own hands the appointment of the Recorder, she yielded gracefully to a respectful remonstrance from the Corporation. Her successor cultivated sedulously the good graces of the citizens, and granted them important and valuable charters.

But it was in the next generation that the immense importance to which London had grown was most fully seen, and that the Corporation acquired their noblest title to the gratitude of posterity. None of the adversaries of Charles I. pursued upon the whole a more honourable and blameless course. The dignity and beauty of Charles's own character were not unappreciated by them, and personally he never received anything but respectful and even cordial treatment at their hands. But they were inflexibly opposed to his attempts to govern without his parliament; they resisted his arbitrary measures with firmness, but with temper; and in their famous protection of the five members, whom the king wished to arrest, and who fled for refuge to the city, they took the strongest and most important step which had then been taken in defiance of his power. They were unmoved by his personal menaces and persuasions; yet they kept within the law; and neither the king himself, nor the king's party, appear ever to have impugned their motives, or accused them of conduct either contumacious or insulting. Their steady maintenance of the cause of the Parliament is agreed by all historians of the time to have been one main reason for its success; their troops were amongst the best in the armies of the Parliament; their money contributions amongst the largest and most frequent which the Parliament received. Nor must we forget, whatever we may think of the means which the Parliament employed, that the result of their struggle, after the short despotism of Cromwell, was to settle the question of English freedom; and to make it impossible for us ever to be enslaved without being first corrupted and debased. In this great struggle the city bore a leading part; but it lent no countenance to the extreme measures of Cromwell, and so far as it could, resisted his supremacy. With this stormy period the national importance of the City of London ceases all at once. The subsequent hostilities between the capital and the government under Charles II. and James II., although no doubt they excited great attention, and probably added considerably to the national discontent, belong to another order of things, when the city was losing its relative weight and influence, and

becoming merely one great mercantile community amongst a powerful and increasing people. And since that time it has sunk very rapidly in estimation and respect; and if it wields any great political influence now, it is that only which any man, or any set of men, may just as well exercise, who do not scruple to employ the power of an enormous revenue, in all ways, direct and indirect, for maintaining and extending it.

It will be seen hereafter that we have no desire to become the apologists of the city, or to see them protected in the enjoyment of powers which they have abused, and privileges of which they are utterly unworthy. But before we wonder at, or blame our ancestors for conceding to the Corporation rights which time has shown to be unwise, it is only fair to recollect that the city of their day, and the city of ours, are two wholly different things; and that a commerce and population has grown up in England, and especially round the boundaries of the city, of which our forefathers could never in their wildest dreams have arrived at any adequate conception. A king who owed his crown or his security to the great Corporation, might neither unwisely nor ungracefully concede to them enormous privileges. A people who acquiesced in his sway, at any rate a large and victorious party in the country, would not be disposed to grudge the price paid for success, or very jealously to scrutinise the present wisdom or possible future policy of grants, which had either secured their own victory, or effectually consummated their opponents' defeat. Moreover, when London stood comparatively alone as the representative of the trade of England, a great many advantages were rightly and fairly conceded, for which now there could be neither reason nor defence. And thus it has happened that a body whose existence is perpetual, although its character has changed, meets the angry scrutiny of these times, clothed with privileges and wielding powers of which it is the very unfitting possessor, but which were possibly in their origin the legitimate adjuncts of a position, which has been long since relinquished or destroyed.

It is not easy to point out the definite period at which the character of the Corporation began to alter; and from which, although its legal powers may have remained, its substantial influence and authority in the state began to decay. The sources and the nature of the change alike prevent the stages of it from being marked by clear and distinct symptoms. Even before the civil wars in the time of Charles I. there are indications, neither few nor obscure, that the vulgar civic character was already growing up, and that contempt and dislike were mingling with the feelings entertained towards the city by the general mass of English society. The dramatic writers of the

times of Elizabeth, James, and Charles—Middleton, Heywood, Massinger, Shirley, and others—are full of passages, showing that arrogant pride of purse, together with a mean subserviency to men of rank, and a desire to purchase by wealth admission to the society and families of noblemen and courtiers, were supposed to be unfailing marks of the civic character. No doubt, for the sake of humour and effect, these failings were often represented by the dramatist in an extreme and exaggerated form; yet the satire could hardly have been applied if there was no cause for it, nor would writers, entirely dependent upon popular applause, have ventured to run counter to the popular feeling and belief. The reign of Charles II. was not very likely to raise the tone or credit of the city; and the fact that, since his time, dramatic satire has been levelled elsewhere, may show no more than that it is not worth while to be attacking a body, whose social and political importance has so greatly declined.

In truth, the gradual growth of the metropolis has been fatal to the pretensions of the city. Outside the city walls a vast community has sprung up, even separate portions of which greatly exceed the city in wealth, importance, and the rank and power of their inhabitants. It would be a curious inquiry, and would lead to very interesting results, to trace the growth of the metropolis, and the absorption within the bounds of one vast city of its various component and originally distinct portions. For our present purpose it is enough to say that when the judges breakfasted at the village of Charing in their way to Westminster, when noblemen's villas and their stately gardens lay all along the Strand, when Moorfields was a swamp, and Bethnal-green a meadow, and snipes could be shot in S. Martin's-lane, and Paddington was a distant village, the relations of the city to all these places, and to the country at large, must have been wholly different from those which exist at present. The city and the metropolis of England were then substantially the same. But the city did not see the absolute necessity, or were unable to conceive the practical wisdom, of maintaining the existence of the same state of things. They did not foresee that privileges conceded for good reasons at one time might become untenable if the reasons ceased to exist at another. At any rate so it was, that never, all through the history of the Corporation, does there appear to have been the slightest inclination to enlarge the boundaries of the city, to increase the area of the benefits of civic privileges, to constitute themselves representatives and benefactors of the whole metropolis, or to gather round the city, as a natural centre, and connect with it, as integral portions, the gradually widening and multiplying districts which lie beyond the boundaries.

It is true that, as in the case of Southwark, (the connexion of which with the city is now little more than nominal, and has never been effective or beneficial,) the situation of the metropolitan districts within the counties of Middlesex, Kent, and Surrey would have rendered necessary the interposition of Parliament, from time to time, to prevent the conflict of jurisdictions, and to place them effectively within the full benefits of the jurisdictions and privileges belonging to London proper. The city, as our readers are aware, is a county in itself, and entirely separate from Middlesex; whereas Southwark never has been, and could not be, taken out of Surrey, except by Act of Parliament: a king's charter could not, in historic times, alter the boundaries of a county; and, chiefly, perhaps, for this reason, its connexion with London was never, in the palmiest days of the city, at all a beneficial one. In like manner, no doubt, the huge tracts of houses now aggregated round the city must have been added to it from time to time by Act of Parliament, if they were to form, in any legal and practical sense, integral parts of it. In the days of the city's power there would, however, have been no difficulty in obtaining such Acts, if ever there had existed the inclination. The disunion of the city and the metropolis is certainly the result, most likely unforeseen, of the selfish policy which the Corporation have pursued. It might not, indeed, be expedient for the country, nor for the executive Government, to have the municipal authority of the whole metropolis vested in the hands of a single corporation. A real Lord Mayor of London, of the whole undivided town, might, in times of domestic turmoil, be a very awkward officer for the Home Secretary to deal with. But it was not, indeed it could not have been, from any such prescient apprehensions, that centuries ago the city was content to confine itself within the narrow boundaries which had sufficed for it in Saxon times. The London of Charles II. gave no promise of the London of Victoria. No prophetic alderman of the sixteenth or seventeenth centuries could have foreseen that extending the benefits (at that time very great) of city rights and franchises to the surrounding hamlets would ever produce the smallest inconvenience. It was the rising spirit of selfishness and clique which restricted their view to their own supposed advantage, and the increase of their own dignity. They retained for their own exclusive benefit all which they had extracted from the Parliament or the Crown, and their successors will suffer for it, as it is but just they should. They obtained these rights as being the metropolis, or as representing it, and they must not be permitted to retain them merely to be used against that which they profess to represent.

It would not, perhaps, be just thus to deal with them if the Corporation had shown any signs of a more liberal and generous temper, or if the maintenance of these privileges was consistent with an enlarged expediency, or with justice to the rest of the community. But it is in the nature of exclusive bodies to become more and more selfish and exclusive, and the Corporation of London have proved no exception to the rule. In fact, of late years, their affairs have been managed in a spirit increasingly narrow and vulgar-minded. This has arisen, probably, to some extent, from the gradual withdrawal from amongst them of the highest class of merchants, and the substitution of the shopkeeper class and the shopkeeper spirit as the ruling element in corporation affairs. The great merchants have gone to live elsewhere. Within the memory of not very old persons, the city was still the dwelling-place of many a great trading prince, who lived where his business lay, and naturally took part, from time to time, in the municipal government. This is all at an end. The first class men have ceased to reside in the city, and have withdrawn from all share in the management of its affairs. The present Corporation dispute this, and attempted elaborately to disprove it before the recent Commission. But they failed. In spite of Mr. Pearson's laboured and lengthy panegyric upon each member of the Court of Aldermen, the result of which was that they were a set of honest and industrious tradesmen, which no one ever denied, the fact still remains that, with the exception of Alderman Thompson, (who, by the way, is since dead,) not a single member of what may be called the aristocracy of commerce is to be found amongst them. Whether they are a better set of people, and do their work in better style than when great merchants were among them, as they themselves contend in their own defence before the Commission, is another matter, which we will consider by-and-by. The allegation, whatever it may be worth, that the greatest traders in the city at present stand aloof altogether from the Corporation, appears to us to be, beyond controversy, true.

While, however, their internal character has undergone considerable modification, not, certainly, for the better, their external influence, and the prestige of their name, was for a long while undiminished. Their power in Parliament was, and perhaps still is, very considerable. Four members of their own, and a fifth, in the person of the Recorder, united as they almost always are on city questions, make in themselves, and through their various connexions, a formidable phalanx. But the fact of one of their officers, the Remembrancer, being a regular parliamentary agent, with an acknowledged right of access to the House of Commons, bound to watch all bills which affect,

however remotely, the interests of the city, and being constantly on the spot, gives them an advantage with an assembly like the House of Commons possessed by scarcely any other body in the country, and one of which, naturally enough, they make sedulous and skilful use. An amusing instance of their power, of the occasions which they think call for its exercise, and the manner of its employment, was given by one of the witnesses before the recent Commission. It appears that it was proposed by Lord Melbourne to extend the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan Police into the City of London; but, says Mr. Rogers, 'it was objected to by the Corporation. They petitioned the House of Commons. They saw that the Minister was determined. They then addressed the Crown, and a gracious answer was given; but they understood its nature. The Minister was still determined, and they then acted on the French maxim, "Help thyself, and Heaven will help thee." They immediately fixed their Town Clerk in New Palace-yard; they gave him a large body of assistants, and instructed him to communicate with every corporation in the United Kingdom. The consequence was, by the influence of the country corporations, the Minister found that his support fell like a rope of sand. He gave up his measure.' Mr. Rogers is pressed as to the *modus operandi*, but on this he is impenetrable. 'It is not for me to say how; but the thing was done.' No doubt it was, very effectually; and we can easily understand poor Lord Melbourne being routed ignominiously from the field, his parliamentary forces cut off in detail by the repeated sallies of the gallant Town Clerk at the head of his 'large body of assistants' from the intrenched camp in New Palace-yard. Mr. Rogers, we should state, appears, from other portions of his evidence, to be a gentleman of a warm imagination; and the more cautious Remembrancer states in his evidence that he 'should say' this description was 'overcharged.' But it affords a pretty good sample of the popular belief as to the parliamentary influence of the Corporation; and, however the description may be 'overcharged,' we may be quite certain that 'the thing was done;' and that the same thing has been done again and again of late years by the City.

Indeed, if Parliament were the country, and the feelings of Parliament were the reflection of the feelings even of the intelligent portion of the people, it is probable that no reform of the Corporation would ever have taken place. The mass of members of parliament do not understand the subject, and do not care about it. The abuses and anomalies of civic administration never come across or annoy them in any way, and the Commission would have been unissued but for the press and the

public. But although Parliament was apathetic, the press was not; and a cry had been got up to some extent, as we have said, exaggerated and misdirected; and the Government, finding it really necessary to do something, issued a Commission to Mr. Labouchere, Sir John Patteson, and Mr. Cornewall Lewis, to inquire into the subject, and recommend alterations. The result of the labours of these eminent men is before us in a blue book; and their recommendations, practical and sensible as they appear to us to be, will effect little less than a revolution, if they are ever carried into execution. The antiquarian and legal part of the inquiry had been already done to their hands by the former Royal Commissioners in 1837. The City of London, although it escaped legislation at that time, did not escape investigation altogether; and as Sir Francis Palgrave was a member of that Commission, we should expect to find, what is in fact the case, that the historical and documentary information relating to the Corporation was thoroughly exhausted, and admirably digested, (probably by him,) in the summary of evidence appended by those Commissioners to the report they presented to the King. The late Commissioners confined themselves more exclusively to the practical view of the question, to ascertaining the financial position of the city; the working of its municipal system as to its elections, patronage, and general administration; the grounds of the deep and widespread discontent, the existence of which cannot be denied; the particular points in which the city privileges had become galling or intolerable to the community; and, with regard to many of them, the wisdom or even possibility of their continued maintenance. That on such a variety of subjects, so difficult and complicated, they should have arrived at unanimous conclusions, while it says a great deal for their own candour and moderation, says hardly less for the strength of the facts with which they had to grapple.

The Corporation, however, appear to have very much misapprehended the nature of the attack to which they were really most liable to be exposed, and against which they had in truth the weakest defence. Misled by the strong language of the press, and the undiscriminating imputations of some of the extreme reformers, they appear to have thought that individual acts of malversation, and charges of personal corruption, would form the staple of the Commissioners' investigation. This was a mistake. Few only of the witnesses distinctly charged them with corruption; the instances of corruption mentioned were but few; and of those few several failed in proof. They did not, it must be owned, come quite scatheless out of the inquiry; but it was the system and the temper of their administration,

rather than the persons who conduct it, which were most powerfully and successfully impugned. The few instances of misconduct, to which we shall presently advert, were but the natural result of a system in itself rotten and corrupt, full of waste, and extravagance, and selfish jobbing, and only redeemed from universal execration and contempt by the presence in the governing body of many really able and upright men, who would be an honour to any assembly, men such as Mr. Dakin, Mr. Salomons, and others, who no doubt, as far as their influence extends, inspire the Corporation with a better spirit, and lead it now and then into liberal and praiseworthy acts. Their official defence therefore before the Commissioners, though undoubtedly a well-drawn paper of self-laudation, was for the most part irrelevant.

On certain points of primary importance there was no defence to be made. The various municipal constituencies and modes of election in the City, for instance, can be reduced to no common or sensible principle, and have not the defence of some anomalies, that they work well. These anomalies are well stated in the following passage from the recent Report:—

'The voters in the Ward elections must now fulfil two conditions: 1st, they must be freemen of the Corporation; 2dly, they must be occupiers of premises within the ward, rated at not less than 10*l.* per annum, and residing within seven miles of the city. The freedom of the city is acquired by patrimony (or inheritance from parents), by apprenticeship, or by redemption. Before the year 1835 no person could be admitted to the freedom of the city, who did not belong to one of the trading companies; but by a resolution of the Court of Common Council of 17th March, 1835, this condition was repealed, and it is no longer necessary that a freeman should be a liveryman or member of one of the city companies. At present, therefore, the system which governs the elections of the corporations is wholly anomalous; two elective bodies exist, which might by possibility be independent of each other. In the Common Hall elections none vote but liverymen of companies, who, though they must be freemen, need not occupy premises within the city. At the wardmote elections, none vote but ten pound occupiers within the ward, who, though they must be freemen, need not be members of companies. It is therefore a conceivable case that the majority of the voters in Common Hall might not be entitled to vote in the wards, and that a majority of the voters in the wards might not be entitled to vote in Common Hall, so that one set of interests might predominate in the election of lord mayor, and another in the election of aldermen and common councilmen.'

But even the best of these two constituencies, that which votes at ward elections, is by no means free from objection. By its qualifications some of the first traders in the world are excluded from voting, or taking any interest in the municipal affairs of the City, for they are often not freemen of the City, and are scarcely ever resident within it. For the other constituency, that of the Common Hall, not a word is to be said.

The exclusive rights of the Liverymen of the Companies arose out of the encroachments on the general rights of the citizens which those bodies began to make in the time of Edward IV., and which after strenuous and ineffectual resistance, were finally legalised by Act of Parliament in the time of George II. It may well have been centuries back, when the various trading companies were practical and working bodies, exercising discipline over the members of their trade, keeping them together, teaching them their art, answering for their characters, extending to them a kindly and paternal protection and support, that to be a member of a company implied being a respectable man, and that a man who was not a member of some company or other had little business or interest in the city. But that state of things, if it ever existed, has long since passed away. The Companies, except two or three, such as the Stationers', the Apothecaries', and the Goldsmiths', have ceased to have any working connexion with the trades whose names they bear. The rich companies give many and good dinners; the poor companies few and bad ones; but connexion with, or interest in the affairs of the Corporation they have, as companies, absolutely none. Yet a certain portion of their members alone elect the Lord Mayor, the Chamberlain, the Sheriffs, and a few other minor civic officers. The elections by the Livery are described without a dissentient voice as marked by the grossest corruption and irregularity. There are no lists of the Liverymen, and the poorer companies have some of the very worst characters in the city amongst their livery. In cases of contested elections false personation and bribery is unlimited. The last election for the office of Chamberlain, which as it is a place of great profit, is generally contested, cost near 10,000*l.* A contested election for the office of Lord Mayor, at the time of the Reform excitement, twenty years ago, cost a nearly similar sum; and no one can pretend to tell the proportion of false and real votes polled on either of these occasions. On the ordinary meetings to elect a Sheriff, only a few persons attend, and these it seems generally of the lowest order, and in the pay of one or more persons who make a market of them. To be sheriff, unless you wish to become a member of the Corporation, is a profitless, troublesome, and very expensive office. A man, liable to be elected, who is elected, must take the office or pay a fine varying in amount from 400*l.* to 600*l.*; and accordingly an unhappy citizen, known to be unambitious of civic dignity, but to be liable to its imposition, is waited upon a few days before the day of election, and told that the honours of the Shrievalty will inevitably fall upon his devoted head, unless he favours the person waiting on him with a cheque, varying in

amount, not to purchase votes but to escape them. Men swear, protest, and pay; for those who will not pay find themselves elected sheriffs, and then either have to pay to the inexorable Corporation 600*l.* for refusing to serve, or have to go through the trouble and annoyance of discharging the duties of the office at the far more serious expense of 1,200*l.* or 1,500*l.* It seems almost incredible, but it is true, that this system has been going on year by year, nay went on within this very last year, in the heart of the capital of England. And we have no doubt that a vast quantity of indignant eloquence on the sanctity of vested rights and the importance of popular assemblies, will be discharged at the head of any minister who is bold enough to propose the abolition of an assembly, which is the scene and occasion of practices so disgraceful. Abolished however it will be, we trust, in accordance with the recommendation of the Commissioners, as most certainly it ought to be.

The chief yearly fruit of this creditable assembly is 'the first magistrate of the first city in the world,' (to use the regular periphrasis of postprandial oratory for the Lord Mayor,) chosen by the Common Hall from those aldermen who have served the office of Sheriff. The production,—separating of course the office from the persons of the respectable men who have filled it, and may fill it again,—is worthy of the soil which grows it. The state and splendour of this dignitary cannot be brought home to an uncivic mind, except by a diligent study of the municipal blue books. If any of these have crossed the channel, we can comprehend the impression of unapproachable magnificence produced upon our French friends' mind, which issued in the famous saying, 'comte, marquis, duc, *peutêtre lord mayor*,' as the summit and *ne plus ultra* of an Englishman's ambition. The Cheapside monarch, like the one at Pimlico, has his lords in waiting, and equerries, and gentlemen at arms, and master of the ceremonies, and carver, and trumpeter, and swordbearer, and captain of his yacht, and a lot more, under quaint, and perhaps ancient, but certainly obscure appellations. There is for instance the serjeant carver, and serjeants of chamber, and serjeant of channel, and yeomen of the waterside, and water bailiff, and barge-master, and common hunts' young man, and common crier's young man, and water-bailiff's first and second young man, and many others; not domestic servants, be it observed, (for a lord mayor might perhaps be indulged with a dozen footmen,) but *officers* of state, with salaries, and dresses, and fees, bringing many of these places up to 350*l.* and 400*l.* a-year. If we turn to the account of their functions, we shall generally find them comprised in the mystic words, 'to attend the Lord Mayor."[1] Now

[1] See Report of 1837, p. 115, seqq.

all this is ridiculous nonsense. What pretence is there for giving a man 350*l.* a-year to 'attend the Lord Mayor,' generally now a respectable retail trader, elected in rotation to administer municipally for a year one-ninth, and that not the most important ninth of the metropolis? The aggregate of his expenses is enormous. Mr. Williams, the Member for Lambeth, in his evidence, charging the interest of the money which has been expended on the Mansion-House, puts him down as costing 25,000*l.* a-year. This is certainly somewhat more than can be fairly charged, but if we put him at 20,000*l.* a-year, we shall probably be not very far wrong.[1] And the greatest part of this money is simply wasted, in childish pageants or foolish state and feasting, which do not the smallest good to any one, and for which no sensible man respects the office one atom the more. The mayors of Liverpool, of Bristol, of Leeds, of Manchester, of Hull, and other places, govern larger, wealthier, and more important populations for less than a twentieth of this sum. To abate the vulgar display of the Lord Mayor and his household will we hope be an early duty of the reformed Corporation.

The Aldermen, who come next on the civic pyramid of which the Lord Mayor is the apex, are open to observations much of the same kind. Elected by their wards for life, and existing as a separate court, with unchecked command over the City's purse, they occupy positions and claim a consideration altogether unreal and absurd. To judge from Mr. Pearson's series of biographical sketches presented to the Commissioners at the close of their labours, they are, at present, a thriving set of tradesmen, or of tradesmen who have retired upon a competence. Their functions, except that of eating and drinking, do not appear of a very exalted or important character. They sit with the judges at the Old Bailey, as Mr. Rogers says,[2] to assist the judges, as every one else knows, never presuming to interfere. They act as magistrates with various success, generally speaking through their clerk, like other magistrates, occasionally also like other magistrates disregarding him, *not* to the advantage of the public nor of their own reputation. And practices were deposed to by witnesses of the highest respectability as occasionally obtaining amongst them, by no means creditable either to their taste or feeling. It appears for

[1] In the statement of the City accounts, at page xxvii. seqq. of the Report of the late Commission, which is very well done, the civil government of the City, 'including the Lord Mayor,' is set down at 27,000*l.* per annum altogether. But we are puzzled by the term 'civil government.' It does *not* include judges' salaries, nor expenses of magistracy, which are put down at an additional 17,500*l.*, nor police, prisons, and coroner, which figure for 29,000*l.* more. What *great* items it *does* include besides the Lord Mayor we do not know; we suspect few or none.

[2] Evidence, p. 266.

decided against him in the Court of Queen's Bench, and he told me he paid 1,200*l.* for penalties and the law expenses; the expenses being of course swelled by the enormous fees of the City Solicitor, the Remembrancer, and the law officers of the city.

'When was that case decided?—About ten years ago.

'Was the prosecution instituted by the City?—Yes; in the name of Mr. Clark, who was the Chamberlain, on the information of an informer whom he employed for this purpose.'—Evidence, p. 334.

The Common Council re-enacts upon a greater scale and in more numerous examples the part played by the Lord Mayor and Aldermen. Consisting as it does of 240 members, besides the Aldermen, for all of whom dinners are to be found and business provided, all of whom have friends to serve and interests to promote, we may readily imagine the consumption of time, the waste of money, the extent of jobbing, of which it is the source. Every body is on some one or more of the committees, into which the whole body is divided. Each of these committees has its allowance for expenses, which means for dinners, and many thousands a year still go in these civic feastings. The chairmen are selected, we are told, for strength of head and stomach, rather than of intellect and reason. And these perpetual dinners and committees of course foster a spirit of exclusiveness and clique, and encourage a waste of time in doing business, which makes the business ill-done and done often in a vexatious and litigious way. An executive body of 266, split up into committees of 25 or more, is obviously the most inconvenient and senseless machine that ever was invented for doing any work. Every one must have his plan, his speech and his dinner. And the temptation to play into one another's hands which must arise from this constant intercourse and gossip, the history of the Corporation shows to be in fact, what common sense tells us it would be, altogether irresistible.

For as a manufactory of business and of places, the Corporation of London is unrivalled in the world. In addition to the conservancy of the river, which does not add largely to their staff, they have to conduct the ordinary business of a not very large municipality. Their income from every source, including the coal-tax and the rates which they lay on the inhabitants, is about 550,000*l.* a-year. The number of their officers we cannot venture even to approximate. Two folio pages of the Report of 1837, are occupied by the names of some of them only. Mr. Hickson states, and we are sure he does not overrate, the aggregate income of these officers alone at 120,000*l.* a-year, which is nearly *six times* as much as the *whole expenditure* of the Borough of Leeds, a place in population and extent considerably larger than the City of London. But this state of things becomes u intelligible when we fully comprehend several inflexib

which appear to guide the discharge of business by the Corporation. Upon any given head of business, they first appoint one or two officers, each at a salary larger than that which is paid anywhere else for the discharge of the whole of a similar class of business. They then add a large establishment of clerks, who together cost perhaps double the salary of the head officer, and thus the business is done at almost three times the cost, by double the number of people it requires. Another rule is to divide accounts and multiply offices as much as possible, and thus they manage to get four or five establishments where one would do, and places for four or five times the number of retainers which is really wanted. Another, is to appoint efficient men to conduct different departments, who understand their business and can do it; and then to subject them to the perpetual interference of large committees, composed of incompetent men, who do not understand anything about the business, and who are simply and very greatly in the way. By a single-minded attention to these rules, and to the principle which animates them, it is wonderful how much may be got out of how little, and what a number of respectable men may receive respectable salaries out of an amount of business, which persons unversed in these rules would never think required either the men or the salaries. This reads like sarcasm, but it is simple truth. There are, for instance, three solicitors under different names and with separate establishments, to do the work of one, three judges with (in the aggregate) unreasonable salaries where one would be enough, four counsel to advise where one would be abundant. So almost every one who came before the Commission bore testimony to the high character and great ability of the heads of various departments under the Corporation. Not only the judicial officers, of whom every one speaks with great respect, but harbourmasters, bridgemasters, chief clerks, controllers, and the rest are all spoken of as excellent in their different ways; and the universal complaint has been of perpetual and mischievous interference with them by the committees of the Corporation, who waste time and mismanage everything they undertake.

This is the real charge which the Corporation have to meet, the charge of being a selfish, exclusive jobbing body, wastefully extravagant in their management, spending public money not for the public good, neglecting great interests, obstructing improvement, impeding commerce, oppressing individuals. Some curious and instructive instances came out in the course of the investigation, showing that the general impression on these heads was certainly not unfounded and hardly exaggerated.

In 1853 the Corporation issued at one blow 4,032 processes

against persons in the City for not taking up their freedom. They were all retail traders, and mostly poor men; and rightly to estimate the proceeding of the Corporation, it should be remembered, that the Corporation had themselves brought in a bill just before, in which they had in fact resigned the right of thus enforcing freedom; and that the freedom conferred absolutely no benefits whatever upon the persons compelled to take it up. It was simply a means of frightening so much money out of the pockets of poor people, who of course could not venture to go to law with the City; and the money was extorted to swell the City's income and the fees of the City's officers. The great men who could and would fight the City, who could resist and perhaps get the obnoxious law abolished, the great merchants and wholesale dealers, on no legal and equitable principle, but from very intelligible if not very creditable motives, have been always let alone by the Corporation.

In one respect only have the Corporation ventured to attack great men. We mentioned some pages back that a man liable to be elected Sheriff, who was elected and who declined to serve, had to pay 400*l.* or 600*l.* to the City chest. These fines in comparatively recent times were made the means of the most iniquitous extortion. If the Corporation wanted money, men were nominated in numbers who it was known would not serve, for the mere purpose of appropriating their fines. Thus the enormous expense of the civic entertainments to the foreign Sovereigns in 1814, was defrayed by exacting 26,199*l.* from private individuals, in the five years from 1814 to 1818, inclusive. The same spirit has been shown once or twice since, but it is only fair to say that great improvement has taken place in this respect in the last twenty years. How far a discussion in the House of Commons and a return moved for and obtained by Mr. Divett, (from which we have taken the above facts,) may have influenced the Corporation, we cannot tell; but for some reason or other they have been influenced, and there is no ground for saying that just at the present time they at all seriously abuse this power. It is, however, a power obviously very unsafe; very liable to abuse, and which has been in fact abused; and one which therefore we hope will not be allowed to continue in the hands of persons constantly exposed to peculiar temptations to abuse it.

The Corporation enjoy the right of levying tolls on all vehicles belonging to persons not free of the City, on entering or leaving the City and its liberties. It would never do to enforce this on carriages; the thing would have blown up long ago. So if a great lady comes from the West End to a shop Ludgate Hill, and carries away with her silks and velvets [1]

amount of 20*l.* or 30*l.* she goes and returns unquestioned. But if a poor fellow with a donkey cart buys a pat of butter, or a bit of fish, or a leg of mutton, the inexorable Corporation mulct him on the spot. Nor is there in this, any more than in the former cases, any pretence of benefit resulting either to the individual or the public. It is a tax for the sole benefit of the Corporation, levied, as the former were levied, with a very odious sort of discrimination.

So again in the exercise of powers which they claim as conservators of the river Thames, the same selfish and illiberal spirit is discernible. The bed and soil of the river is matter which had long been fiercely contested between them and the Crown. But with a title of known weakness and doubt, the Corporation have been in the habit of granting licences to individuals to erect projections into the stream, or to embank the river, of course on the payment of certain fees; and if any one presumes to deal in any way with the soil of the river without their permission, a lawsuit with the Corporation would be inevitable. But it was proved before the Commissioners that their notion of duty ceased with the due reception of the fee. Suspecting possibly that they could not prevent erections in the river, and thinking it as well to profit by them, they are in the habit of making grants quite inconsistent with the interest of their own prior grantees; and if asked to interpose with their authority to vindicate rights encroached upon, and to prevent litigation, they discover that they have no power to interfere, and that the whole matter (except their right to the fee) is in considerable doubt and obscurity. In short, they do not really conserve the Thames; they do not remove shoals; they do not prevent encroachments; they license them when it brings them money to do so; they abstain from interference when to interfere would be inconvenient and unprofitable.

But it is when the Corporation go to law that we see in its fullest development their unpopular and oppressive character. Their legal proceedings are indeed the strongest arguments for curtailing their powers, and reducing within more reasonable limits a revenue which tempts them to such vast expenditure. The pomp and panoply of retainers with which the Corporation take the field, and the immense resources of legal artillery and engineering which they employ to overwhelm, embarrass, and delay, are enough to frighten, and do in fact frighten, most opponents into submission before the commencement of actual hostilities. Now and then, however, they meet a rich or stubborn antagonist, and then the picture becomes instructive. Two great lawsuits were detailed in evidence before the late Commission. One was a suit with the Crown as to the bed and

soil of the river. That action has been pending for more than ten years. It has taken that time to compel the Corporation to give a satisfactory account of their title, and during that time there have been nine several decisions on this preliminary point in the case, from Masters in Chancery, Masters of the Rolls, Lord Chancellors, and the House of Lords, and every single one against them.

The other was a suit with the great brewers, Combe, Delafield & Co. The Corporation claim a right to measure, and to be paid for, all measurable articles brought, not into the City, but into the Port of London; the port reaching from Yantlet Creek in Kent to Staines Bridge in Middlesex, a distance by the river of something between eighty and ninety miles. Combe & Co. made a great quantity of malt in Norfolk, which they brought up in their own ships to their own wharf in Westminster, and thence carried it to their great brewery in the Seven Dials. All this malt the City claimed to measure. Combe & Co. replied that they did not want it measured, they knew the quantity, and were not going to sell, but to use it themselves. Thereupon the City claimed to be paid for it as if they had measured it. This amounted to a claim on Combe & Co. of about 1,000*l.* a-year. This claim Messrs. Combe resisted, and went to war in 1839. Since that time there have been, as in the other case, a number of pitched battles, every single one adverse to the City. Three times do Messrs. Combe except to the answers of the City, and each time with success. In vain, however, do they apply to see certain documents on which the City put their startling claim. Inspection is refused them, the Vice-Chancellor orders it; the City appeal, and the Lord Chancellor confirms the order; the City appeal again, and, till a few months ago, on this collateral point they have hung up the matter in the House of Lords. It had already cost Messrs. Combe between 2,000*l.* and 3,000*l.*; and at last Mr. Pearson told the Commissioners, that the Corporation never meant to stir the case, for they felt that their right, if they had it, was one which they could not enforce. It is all very well to say this now, in the case of wealthy brewers, powerful enough to hold their own against the Corporation, but we should like to know how often the exercise of the right against smaller and unresisting men has been magnanimously given up, and when it was that the eyes of the Corporation were first opened to the monstrous nature of the right they claimed. Here is a naked claim of 1,000*l.* a-year from a single firm for the sole benefit of the Corporation; there is no pretence of any countervailing advantage to be received by the firm; the firm are put to an expense which to poor men would

all possibly still in existence, because not specifically abolished by Act of Parliament, should be allowed to linger on in a doubtful and twilight life, to tempt the astuteness of the City lawyers, and to be disinterred perhaps now and then to defeat some just claim, or enforce some harsh exaction. The Commissioners have recommended that the customs which it is desirable to retain should be enumerated and enacted once for all by Parliament, that all customs not enumerated in the Act should cease and be repealed, and that the interpretation of the customs of London, like that of all other laws local or general, should be intrusted, as it ought to be, to the Judges of the Superior Courts. Few persons, we imagine, except those immediately connected with the Corporation, will doubt the wisdom and expediency of this recommendation.[1]

Again, the whole history and administration of one of their most important sources of revenue, the tax on coal, is equally discreditable to them. Their possession of it arose in the first instance out of a breach of trust. The Court of Aldermen, in their character of Court of Orphans, are by old custom trustees for the personal estate of orphans in the city. A sum of 750,000*l.* was in their hands in this capacity in the reign of Charles II. This sum they lent to the king, and the king having spent it, refused to repay it. They had no kind of right to lend the money. The orphans grew clamorous, and the Corporation, bound to repay them, knew not where to find the means. From Parliament, in the time of William and Mary, they obtained a grant of four-pence per ton for ever on all coal imported into the port of London, in addition to the charge of eight-pence per ton for metage, which they enjoyed under a charter of James I. A very complicated series of Acts in succeeding reigns has raised this duty to thirteen-pence per ton, and continued it at that rate to 1862, extending the tax to all coals brought within twenty miles of the General Post Office.[2] Nine-pence per ton of this duty the City receive, but administer under special Acts of Parliament; four-pence

[1] The whole subject of whether general acts of Parliament repeal City Customs *in pari materiâ*, without specifically naming them, is exceedingly difficult and subtle. Mr. Pulling and Mr. Sergeant Merewether, both highly competent persons, differed materially in their evidence on this matter when examined by the late Commission. The City Customs being in fact local Acts of Parliament, the question is raised on each occasion (and some of the occasions are very serious), whether a general act has repealed a particular act which is inconsistent with it; one of the most doubtful questions in the law, and one on which the decisions of the Courts have been constantly conflicting.

[2] Those who desire to understand an important practical matter will find the result of these various Acts stated with great clearness and precision in a paper presented to the late Commission, by Mr. Tyrrell, the present Remembrancer, and printed p. 639 of their evidence.

but mismanaged, inefficient and powerless. Their affairs are in the hands of an official called the Shifter, appointed by the City, at a salary fixed by the City, and not by the Fellowship. This person also receives the metage dues on corn for the Corporation, and in respect of this he receives no salary; so that the Corporation make a poor body pay him enough for their own work, and for the work of the Corporation also, which is a rich body, but in this instance frugal, for it gets work done at other persons' expense. But farther: the actual work of corn metage is performed by one meter and five or six of the Fellowship of Porters, and the meter does no more nor more important work than the porters do. The metage dues are paid to the City in respect of the single meter; the trade pay separately for the services of the porters; and from a table before us we gather that the single meter receives for metage dues about as much as all the porters receive for actually doing the metage. The case then stands thus:—First, the metage is collected for the City, a rich body, at the expense of the Porters a poor one; then, the actual metage is done *really at the expense of the trade*, the toll, in respect of which it ought to be done by the City, going into their hands very nearly clear of all expense. And these are the very men who, when the tolls are in other persons' hands, as in the case of coal, fruit, &c., profess to think it very wrong that the trade should be put to any expense by those who receive the tolls! Little is heard about it, because the Porters are unpopular, and the corn trade charge the extra expenses to the consumer, but as an exhibition of the civic spirit it is very complete.

Illiberal and unhandsome as these proceedings are, there is, we must observe, nothing in them which can be fairly called corrupt, nothing which touches the personal honour of any member of the Corporation. We can conceive, indeed we can believe the fact to be, that honourable and high-minded men, (and many members of the Corporation are both in an eminent degree,) can blind themselves to the real character of acts which they find in accordance with the precedents of a Corporation, and can be led astray by bad example, and by the influence of a bad surrounding atmosphere, from the courses which as individuals they would undoubtedly pursue. They sink, in fact, their own individuality in the abstraction of the body to which they belong, and justify doing things for its sake, which they never would think of doing for their own. We must not shrink from saying, however, that evidence has been published by the Commissioners which seems to go considerably beyond this, and to convict members of the Corpora[illegible] conduct which something like wilful delusion alone co[illegible] There have been, till quite of late years, [illegible]

sioners called 'great,' what we should venture to call 'gross' abuses in the management of the Irish property. The Irish Society, a curious offshoot of the Corporation, in fact one of its committees, (the governor of the society being necessarily an alderman, and all the members of it necessarily members of the Common Council,) is a body of trustees to manage certain large estates in and about the towns of Londonderry and Coleraine, for the general advancement of religion and civilization in the north of Ireland. Twelve of the London companies, members of which contributed the funds wherewith the plantation of Ulster was effected by the City of London, in the time of James I. after the repeated rebellions of the Earls of Tyrone and Tyrconnell, hold also in several-ty large estates in that part of the country; and, till quite of late years, the Irish Society was accustomed to distribute large sums of money yearly amongst these companies, instead of spending their whole revenue to advance the purposes for which they were incorporated. This was bad enough; but it appears also that quite recently they were in the habit of mingling in all the corruptions and excitements of Irish elections, and that on one occasion as much as £3,000 of these sacred trust moneys were spent by the Society in promoting the return of their governor in a contested election for Coleraine. This was very disgraceful; and we fear is but too good a proof of what the same men would have done with the funds of the City of London, if the temptation to misappropriation had been as great, and the risk of immediate detection of it as small, in London as in Ulster.

For even where the risk of immediate discovery was considerable, practices have been ventured upon, to say the least, very questionable, the real character of which, however, even after it had been pointed out to them, the Corporation witnesses appeared unable to appreciate. Some little time ago the Corporation, not satisfied with their position before the world, and unable to command the services of any well-established newspaper, actually negotiated and completed the purchase of a paper, which was to set them straight with mankind, and do justice to their virtues and good deeds. The paper died after a very brief and ineffective life; *but the money for its purchase came out of the Corporation funds, and was disguised under some vague and general item in the published accounts.* This transaction speaks for itself, and our readers will probably not hesitate to apply to it its right epithets, though we refrain. Equally unfortunate, and equally indefensible, appear to have been the proceedings taken by the City to oppose the removal of Smithfield Market. The Corporation appointed a Committee to conduct the opposition, with unlimited power over the City purse; for it was conceived

to be matter of paramount importance to the interests of the Corporation that infuriated beasts should be driven headlong, by hundreds, through the most crowded streets of London into the very heart of the city; and that the filth and stench of the blood and offal of their slaughter should be congregated in the midst of a dense population. Accordingly the Committee set vigorously to work, and spared no expense. In the happy phrase of Mr. Benjamin Scott, they proceeded 'to elicit public opinion;' which meant, as he explained it under the Commissioners' gentle pressure, that they sent round paid agitators to make speeches at prepared meetings, to concoct petitions, and to procure, how is not specified, all the signatures which could be obtained. They marched a platoon of counsel into the parliamentary committee rooms to oppose the Bill there. Other legal and medical gentlemen were paid for 'literary services.' Articles 'found their way into newspapers' in an unexplained, but peculiarly opportune fashion. Lawyers demonstrated that to touch Smithfield Market would be tyrannically to violate the first and most sacred principles of municipal liberty. Doctors proved that fevered meat was peculiarly wholesome, and exhalations from slaughter-houses singularly salubrious. Mr. Scott admitted that any payments for these services would be looked for in vain in the published statement of the City's accounts. They were disguised under the general entry of 'miscellaneous expenditure;' why he did not exactly know, but it had been 'considered' better not to go into detail, and he had observed, as matter of experience, that agitations were most successful when most apparently spontaneous, and when their causes and sources were most carefully concealed.

There is scarcely another public body in the kingdom which would have set to work in a fashion so undignified, so clumsy, and so entirely contrary to good feeling and right principle. Scorn at their detection mingles with indignation at their misuse of public position, public character and public money. And when we see that this is what some of their best men appear to be still inclined to vindicate, and even on a similar occasion to repeat, we cannot but feel it is high time that some order was taken with them, and that they should be told that, whatever they may think of it, such conduct is neither decent nor respectable; that if it came to be often repeated, the present demand for their reform would speedily become a cry for their abolition; that it would be impossible for men of honour and character, such as now illustrate and adorn their ranks, to stand by them any longer, or share even the divided responsibility of such proceedings, and that they would rapidly sink from their present influential and honourable position, to a far lower level,

and become the refuge of men bankrupt in means and character, who would neither deserve nor receive the smallest measure of popular respect.

> 'Miseræ plebi commune sepulchrum
> Pantolabo scurræ Nomentanoque nepoti.'

What is the defence which the City have set up to this case against them? As it seems to us, one totally inapplicable and irrelevant. They addressed themselves to defend the legality of their proceedings, their solvency, their personal honour, their general freedom from peculation or corruption. We grant it fully. Subject, as we have said already, to some not numerous exceptions, their antagonists had not attacked the positions which they selected to defend. Doubtless no cloud rests upon the stainless honour of such a man as Mr. Wortley, of whom it is impossible to conceive that he could ever lend himself to any indirect or unworthy course. And if no one else in the Corporation is of the high rank and connexion of the Recorder, there are yet not wanting men of probity and ability, who in a better system, and under other circumstances, would probably have more weight than they have at present, but upon whom it would be unjust, and even absurd to attempt to cast a personal imputation. But these men form part of a body very inferior to themselves; they cannot be ubiquitous; they do not know of a great deal that goes on; and they often find themselves committed to a course of conduct, or made responsible for a proceeding of which it is impossible they can approve, but which they are too generous openly to condemn. It is as unfair and as fallacious to judge of the Corporation by the few picked men whom it contains, as it would be to judge of the character and calibre of the House of Commons by Mr. Gladstone, or Mr. Walpole, or Lord John Russell. The Corporation, in their formal address, did not defend, they did not allude to many of the transactions which we have detailed; and as, judging from the ability of that paper, it is certain that no topic which could be successfully handled, was omitted, we may safely conclude that if nothing was said on these matters, it was for the very good reason that nothing could be said. We should certainly have been glad if some of the proceedings we have been describing had been pointedly disavowed, and regret had been expressed for them. No real dignity would have been lost by such a course. And it must be remembered that if we have absolved many of the Corporation from active participation in them, they have not chosen to absolve themselves from silent and contented acquiescence. Perhaps no stronger proof of the evil influences of the existing Corporation spirit can be given, than that men

of undoubted personal honour do not feel it necessary to protest against measures which they find it impossible to defend.

The point on which alone they made any successful stand was their reply to the accusation that the great merchants had left their ranks during the last century. As to this matter, however, the chief stress of their reply was an inculpation of their predecessors. The Corporation, say they, were bankrupt; jobbing was carried on to an unheard-of height; and aldermen were insolvent, a century ago. It may be so. We are quite willing to take the word of the Corporation for it, that their predecessors were much worse than themselves. But this does not establish the benefits of civic rule, nor make out the purity of the present system.

To the rest of the real substantial attack upon them, they make no real answer. They aver that they have kept within the bounds of the law; that they have charters to show for their rights; Acts of Parliament for their tolls and taxes; opinions of counsel for their lawsuits. Who was ever fool enough to doubt it? Whatever may have been the case in former times, the intelligent officers who now administer their affairs are quite sure to take care that nothing is done without at least a plausible, sometimes a sound, legal reason. How does this meet the charge that they act in a selfish, narrow spirit? Of course they have charters on which they build their claims. How does this tend to show that the claims are not vexatious and oppressive? They have Acts of Parliament in abundance to show for their coal and other taxes. Does that go to prove that Parliament was wise or just, that the taxes in question are politic or tolerable, or that they have been administered in a wise, ungrudging, and conciliatory spirit? And as for opinions of counsel! Why, of course, the opinion of a lawyer depends upon the way the case is stated to him; and we have little doubt that, by some not very great ingenuity of statement, an opinion to any effect that is desired may be drawn from any counsel. There is a well-known, and we believe a true, story, that two neighbours who were about to go to law, each for his own satisfaction consulted Sir William Follett upon his case, and each obtained from Sir William an opinion directly in his favour. Besides, a number of considerations ought to weigh with a body like the Corporation, of which, in giving legal advice, a counsel properly takes no cognizance. He advises simply on the legal bearings of a case; and the question with regard to the City was, not whether they had acted as a cautious lawyer would advise a private individual to act, but whether their endless delay and obstruction and vexation and expense showed the proper spirit in which a great public body should

set to work to vindicate a right held by them in trust for the benefit of the public. Perhaps, indeed, they would deny that this was the question. They might say, indeed several of their ablest witnesses, such as Mr. Serjeant Merewether and Mr. Pearson, did say, that these tolls, and dues, and taxes were their private property, for their private benefit. If so, no doubt custom has sanctioned almost any amount of legal subtlety and chicane in defending a man's private estate; but to us the very presenting this view of the matter appears in the light of a plea of guilty to the charge. It could only be put forward by persons who had taken a false view of their position, and were labouring under a total confusion as to the distinction between the property of private individuals and of public bodies. The Corporation of London is in every sense a public body, with public duties; liable at any moment to be destroyed in its very essence by the will of the Legislature—the mere fiction and creature of the law; and it is idle to compare it with private persons, and assimilate its rights to theirs. It obtained its rights as a great public body, and it is absurd to say that a body, which might be dissolved to-morrow, and cease to exist, without any arbitrary or unconstitutional exercise of parliamentary power, can claim to hold its property indefeasibly, and adversely to parliamentary inspection and control, when it cannot create or guarantee its own legal existence or continuance for a single day. But the claim was characteristic of the feeling of the Corporation, and a tolerable evidence of the spirit of their administration. The Commissioners, we are happy to see, have treated it with entire disregard; and have recommended the total and immediate abolition of all such rights and privileges as appear to be oppressive in their character, or inconsistent with general public policy. They have very properly declined to consider the legal foundation for these rights, which is proper matter for a court of law. They have addressed themselves to the far more important practical question, whether it is wise and just to retain them.

With an assertion of the legality of their proceedings the substantial defence of the Corporation really closed. Indeed, the personal claim was inconsistent with any attempt to show that personal feelings had been disregarded, and larger views generally acted upon. Of course, if the coal-tax belongs to them, as any private individual's house belongs to him, it is no reproach to them that they have spent it on themselves. If, really, the rest of the metropolis, and twenty miles round it, have nothing whatever to do with this tax, except to pay it, they cannot complain that they are totally neglected in the application of its proceeds. Certain metropolitan improvements are made, it is true, out of

certain portions of it, under special Acts of Parliament; but there is a portion which the City claim as their own, and regard as a private gentleman regards his estate, and dispose of accordingly. Yet on this and kindred subjects they have been half-hearted and inconsistent. Again and again they were asked by the Commissioners, if they claimed to represent the metropolis? —and again and again they shrank from giving a direct answer to a pertinent but embarrassing question. Mr. Pearson, indeed, took a bold flight. He said the city and the metropolis *were* identical; that their interests did *not* conflict; and he could not, even in imagination, conceive a case in which they *could;* and that the large streets in the city were a direct, and immediate, and tangible benefit to the people of Staines, and Watford, and Hertford, because they all came to town to the Bank to get dividends, and then they had handsome streets to walk in! But the fact that, except where a special Act of Parliament otherwise directed, all their funds, although derived from so wide an area, were spent upon themselves, was not, as indeed it could not be, disputed. Nor could it be disputed that, in spite of their very large revenues, the municipal government of the City of London was as heavy upon the inhabitants as that of any other city of England, without a tithe or a twentieth of the revenues of the Corporation.

In sewerage, in paving, in police, in prisons, they have something to show for their money; all these, especially the last, are remarkably good in the city; but the expense of them all, except the last, is defrayed out of special rates levied upon the inhabitants. In other matters the catalogue of their deeds is barren. It is melancholy to think how many great and noble works might have been achieved by a municipality alive to its duties, and animated by an elevated feeling, out of those vast sums of money which have been for years eaten up in management and in that heavy and tasteless splendour which surrounds the Corporation. Commerce might have been assisted, education advanced, literature encouraged, the arts promoted, religion fostered, and the City of London have become a Venice without its despotism, a Florence without its turbulence, or a Paris without its irreligion. It is not pleasant to contemplate the dull reality of the picture, the more especially as it seems that the Corporation themselves discern nothing unsatisfactory in it, and appear to promise but little amendment for the future. The Town Clerk, an intelligent and educated gentleman, could not the least understand the outcry; the Corporation, he thought, had done nothing they had not a perfect right to do; he was of opinion, in fact, that all alteration would be for the worse, that the whole thing was as nearly perfect as one could expect any human institution to be, and he really could not suggest any amend-

certain portions of it, under special Acts of Parliament; but there is a portion which the City claim as their own, and regard as a private gentleman regards his estate, and dispose of accordingly. Yet on this and kindred subjects they have been half-hearted and inconsistent. Again and again they were asked by the Commissioners, if they claimed to represent the metropolis? —and again and again they shrank from giving a direct answer to a pertinent but embarrassing question. Mr. Pearson, indeed, took a bold flight. He said the city and the metropolis *were* identical; that their interests did *not* conflict; and he could not, even in imagination, conceive a case in which they *could;* and that the large streets in the city were a direct, and immediate, and tangible benefit to the people of Staines, and Watford, and Hertford, because they all came to town to the Bank to get dividends, and then they had handsome streets to walk in! But the fact that, except where a special Act of Parliament otherwise directed, all their funds, although derived from so wide an area, were spent upon themselves, was not, as indeed it could not be, disputed. Nor could it be disputed that, in spite of their very large revenues, the municipal government of the City of London was as heavy upon the inhabitants as that of any other city of England, without a tithe or a twentieth of the revenues of the Corporation.

In sewerage, in paving, in police, in prisons, they have something to show for their money; all these, especially the last, are remarkably good in the city; but the expense of them all, except the last, is defrayed out of special rates levied upon the inhabitants. In other matters the catalogue of their deeds is barren. It is melancholy to think how many great and noble works might have been achieved by a municipality alive to its duties, and animated by an elevated feeling, out of those vast sums of money which have been for years eaten up in management and in that heavy and tasteless splendour which surrounds the Corporation. Commerce might have been assisted, education advanced, literature encouraged, the arts promoted, religion fostered, and the City of London have become a Venice without its despotism, a Florence without its turbulence, or a Paris without its irreligion. It is not pleasant to contemplate the dull reality of the picture, the more especially as it seems that the Corporation themselves discern nothing unsatisfactory in it, and appear to promise but little amendment for the future. The Town Clerk, an intelligent and educated gentleman, could not the least understand the outcry; the Corporation, he thought, had done nothing they had not a perfect right to do; he was of opinion, in fact, that all alteration would be for the worse, that the whole thing was as nearly perfect as one could expect any human institution to be, and he really could not suggest any amend-

attacked,—their brokers' rents, their metage, their coal-tax, their tolls, their vague and unchecked accounts, their enormous expenses of management, their secrecy and obscurity as to their charters,—these and a number of other points are all decided against them by the Report; in courteous and guarded language, no doubt, as befits the station and character of the Commissioners, but in terms clear and unmistakeable. The remedies, though searching and comprehensive, have been applied in a conservative spirit. There has been, we observe, no *doctrinaire* feeling at work to suggest the reforming of London according to some theory of perfection; but the Corporation has been taken as it stands, it has been preserved wherever it was possible or reasonable, and all the changes which are suggested are almost always in accordance with the enactments of the general Municipal Reform Act, which has been proved by experience to work well upon the whole throughout the country. No suggestions are made in detail as to the establishments and expenses of the Corporation, but it is proposed to curtail their funds, to apply an efficient audit to their accounts, to give the great body of citizens at least the opportunity of taking an interest in the working of the system, and to leave to the combined operation of time, general opinion, and good sense, to infuse a better spirit, and limit useless and foolish expenditure. In many particulars the Commissioners have merely confirmed the conclusions of the most intelligent members of the Corporation; with regard to others, such as especially subjecting the aldermen to re-election, abolishing all their tolls and taxes, and dissolving the Irish Society, we fully expect that great opposition will be made to any attempt to put their advice into practice; but their scheme, or something very like it, must be carried, or the whole work will have to be done over again. For in truth the Commissioners have, by the careful and authentic statements of their Report, reduced within more reasonable limits, the extreme pretensions habitually put forward by the Corporation of London, and have shown the little ground there is for submitting to be obstructed by them. These pretensions can hardly survive undiminished the effect of the tabular statement of the population, area, number of houses, and *assessed value* of the property in the city, compared with that of the rest of the metropolis given by the Commissioners in the course of their Report.[1] A good map of London would perhaps answer the

[1] The following is the Table referred to :—

	Metropolis.	City of London.
Area in Acres	78,029	723
Population in 1851	2,362,236	128,833
Inhabited Houses in 1851 . .	305,933	14,693
Assessment in 1852	£9,964,348	£953,110

same end. It would then be seen how complete a delusion it is to suppose that the commerce and the city of London are identical, that there is not vast wealth and commerce beyond the narrow bounds within which the authority of the Corporation is confined. It is plain that some of the metropolitan districts are equal, some even superior to the city in importance, and that it is only its greater antiquity and familiar tradition that maintains it in a predominance to which it has no sufficient claim.

This predominance will be still further diminished if Parliament should sanction the erection of municipalities throughout the metropolis, with a central Board deputed from them for the control of matters of general concern. This is perhaps the most important of the Commissioners' suggestions, and we earnestly hope it will be adopted, for we are sure there is no chance of London being made a fine, convenient, or healthy city till something of this sort is effected for its social government. In practical England, the state of its metropolis, in all that regards its material government and welfare, is a shame and disgrace. There is no cooperation, no unity of purpose or action, no system, no principle. Everything is left to the chance working of individual speculation, and to the powers of multitudes of Boards entirely independent of, and sometimes hostile to, one another. There are, we believe, above seven hundred local Acts of Parliament in force in different parts of London. In one parish, S. Pancras, it appears from the evidence before us that there are seventeen different Paving Boards, which after all do not comprise the whole parish within the limits of their powers. And the want of union between Gas Companies, and Water Companies, and Paving Boards, and Commissioners of Sewers, has become a proverb and a standing nuisance. So certainly as a street is beautifully paved and smoothly laid down, it is torn up to dig a sewer or lay gas-pipes. And so if a street is begun in one part of London which it would be desirable to connect with a street in another, it is absolutely certain that the desired connexion will not take place; it is probable that some peculiarly ugly and inconvenient obstruction will be built exactly where it ought not. Within the last year the front view of S. Paul's has been seriously damaged by a monster warehouse: and at this very time Mr. Hickson, in his evidence before the Commission, informs the good people of Marylebone that their sewers are about to be entirely deranged by a subterranean railway. The truth is, that except in the City, and there but imperfectly, the inhabitants of the metropolis have no means of expressing their opinion collectively or of being collectively consulted about matters which most intimately concern their social comfort and health. Whether the appointment of municipalities would afford a sufficient remedy

'Of those seven boroughs five received the right of returning members to Parliament under the Reform Act of 1832, and we concur in the opinion expressed by the Lord Mayor, in his evidence given before our Commission, that "as the Legislature has already decided to enfranchise other portions of the metropolis as Parliamentary boroughs, the Legislature ought to complete the work by enfranchising them for municipal purposes also." (Question 7,196). We think, indeed, that if an attempt were made to give a municipal organization to the entire metropolis, by a wider extension of the present boundaries of the City, the utility of the present Corporation, as an institution suited to its present limited area, would be destroyed; while, at the same time, a municipal administration of an excessive magnitude, and therefore ill adapted to the wants of the other parts of the metropolis, would be created. But we see no reason why the benefit of municipal institutions should not be extended to the rest of the metropolis, by its division into municipal districts, each possessing a municipal government of its own. What the form of this government should be, and what should be the number or extent of the districts, are questions not lying within the scope of our Commission, and upon which we are not competent to express any opinion. We recommend, at the same time, that the slight municipal connexion which now subsists between Southwark and the City of London be dissevered; and that some small spaces included within the external boundaries of the City, but not forming a part of it, be annexed to it.

'We may be permitted here to remark, that the power of petition to the Crown for the grant of a municipal corporation, given to Parliamentary boroughs by the Municipal Corporations Act, and by the Act of 1 Vict. c. 78, does not appear to us to be practically applicable to the metropolis. In order that a proper division of the metropolis into municipal districts should be effected, it would be necessary to take a connected view of its different parts, and to arrange the boundaries and size of each district with reference to the other districts. Without such mutual adjustments, a proper combination of districts would be impossible; and such adjustments could not be made, if charters were granted singly to Parliamentary boroughs. If a distribution of the metropolis into municipal districts is to be made, it ought, as it seems to us, to be made simultaneously, and with a due consideration of the manner in which the interests of each part are affected by the general plan.

'In the event of a division of the entire metropolis, such as we have ventured to indicate, being hereafter made by the authority of Parliament, we suggest the creation of a Metropolitan Board of Works, to be composed of a very limited number of members deputed to it from the council of each metropolitan municipal body, including the Corporation of the City. We propose that the management of public works, in which the metropolis has a common interest, should be conducted by this body. At present works of this sort can only be undertaken either by the Corporation of London from its own peculiar funds, or under powers created for the purpose by special legislation, or by the executive Government out of Parliamentary grants. The only fund arising from metropolitan taxation is the coal-tax, a large part of which is, as we have already seen, devoted to metropolitan improvements, under the control either of the Commissioners of Works, or the Corporation of London. We have already explained the origin and nature of that tax, and we pointed out the objections to which its present application is liable; but we reserved our recommendation respecting it for a subsequent part of our Report. We now recommend in the event of a Metropolitan Board of Works being created, that the entire proceeds of the coal-tax, including the 4*d.* tax now payable to the City, be transferred

to its administration, at the earliest period which may be found practicable; and that they remain under that control after the year 1862, in case the coal tax should be prolonged. When that year has arrived, the London Bridge Approaches fund would be broken up; and we think that the fees on freedoms and apprentices payable to this fund ought to be abolished; and that the small duty on wine which now forms a portion of it should, if continued, be added to the fund for maintaining the port of London. We would add, that in the event of a transfer of the 4*d.* coal duty being made in the manner indicated, the compensation for the sea coal meters, and the loan for the Cannon-street improvement, ought to be a continuing charge upon that tax. It is, however, we think, incumbent on the Corporation to provide a sinking fund for the annual discharge of a portion of the loan borrowed for that improvement.

'We propose further, that the Metropolitan Board of Works should be empowered to levy a rate upon the entire metropolis, for any improvement of general utility, within a certain poundage, to be fixed by Act of Parliament. The present poor-rate assessment of the metropolis (according to the limits of the Registrar-General), is nearly 10,000,000*l.*; and a penny rate upon this amount would produce 41,666*l.* Looking to the unequal incidence of the coal-tax, and to the dissatisfaction which it creates in the district over which it is levied, we strongly incline to the opinion that, even if it should not be thought expedient to disturb the existing arrangement before 1862, yet that it will be held advisable to abolish it from that period, and to substitute for it a rate levied upon the whole metropolis, and payable either by the owner or the occupier, or by both in some fixed proportion. If it should not then be thought expedient to renew the coal-tax, as we think probable, we take for granted that the 4*d.* duty now levied on behalf of the City would cease at the same time.

'It is manifest that a power of executing public works of general metropolitan importance, such as the construction of bridges over the Thames, or the opening or widening of main lines of street, accompanied by a power of metropolitan taxation, would, though founded on a basis of popular election, require efficient safeguards for its prudent and useful exercise. We therefore think that the plans for the works to be executed should be submitted to a Committee of the Privy Council, and its consent obtained before they are carried into effect. We may add, that cases may arise where public works may be executed in the metropolis, partly out of the metropolitan fund, and partly from Parliamentary grants, and that in these cases a control of the executive Government such as we have proposed would be indispensable.'

We are almost inclined to regret that the Commissioners did not proceed to more detailed suggestions, and copy more closely, with certain obvious limitations, the system of municipal administration which is found to work so well in Paris. There the Prefect of the Seine, who is the municipal and general administrator of the commune of Paris in all things which have no direct political bearing; the Prefect of Police, who is in fact the executive officer of the Minister of the Interior, and might have great political power; the Municipal Council, who discuss all plans and find the money for them by levying local taxes; and the Mayors of the twelve districts of Paris, who are subject to the Prefect of the Seine; are all appointed directly by the Government, and removable by the Government at pleasure. This would

be objectionable in this country, and by no means required, except that the Metropolitan Police should clearly be in the hands of the Executive. But there really seems no reason why the whole of the architecture, the sewerage, the water-service, the gas, the paving, the markets, bridges, and all cognate matters within the metropolis, should not, as at Paris, be subject to the control of a single municipal Council. In Paris it is appointed by the Government, in London, it might be appointed by the people, and being appointed by them, might be safely trusted with their comforts and their funds. In Paris the Government has the initiative in all propositions, the Council having only a veto, probably under the present Emperor not even that; in London the Council might initiate, the Government retaining the power of veto, to be used whenever they saw occasion. So only we are convinced will combined and comprehensive improvements ever be effected, so only will the interests of all claims of the population of this great city be properly consulted. The minister who should really initiate and carry a plan for the effectual social government of London might improve upon the boast of Augustus, that he found Rome brick and left it marble; for he might say with truth that he had found London a confused and amorphous agglomeration of hamlets, and that he had left it a vast organized and harmonious city.

We have wandered far away from the Lord Mayor, Aldermen and Common Council, and have already transgressed the bounds of an article, and far exceeded the limits of our reader's patience; but we will say in conclusion, that the Corporation will not have existed in vain, nor will even their shortcomings be without their use, if they have given occasion to the first rudiments of a system which may end in making the external splendours of London in some degree answerable to its inexhaustible wealth, and in rendering it not only the largest, the most populous and the richest, but also the most magnificent and beautiful of the capitals of the world.

NOTICES.

Mr. E. G. BRUTON has already published a 'Paper read before the Oxford Architectural Society, on Private Halls,' (J. H. Parker.) This certainly looks like working the Oxford Reform Bill. Mr. Bruton calculates that a Hall for forty students might be built for 6,000*l.*; and in the present scheme he furnishes ground plans: his suggestions are sensible enough.

Mr. Meyrick has printed in an Italian translation his careful excerpts from Cosin and other accredited writers, on the true character, ritual and discipline of the Church of England: its title is 'Della Religione Disciplina e Riti Sacri della Chiesa Anglicana,' &c. Parker is the Oxford and London publisher; and it may be had of Bossange, in Paris, and Biava in Turin. We recommend it to continental tourists, as the work to be placed in the hands of those who are ignorant of the Church of England: on the whole, we should say that it may, in certain quarters, profitably displace Miss Cunningham's kind offices.

Mr. Smyttan has published some verses much more euphonious than his surname—'Florum Sacra,' (J. H. Parker,) which are much above the average. The subject is the delightful one of the ecclesiastical symbolism and associations of the 'lilies of the field.'

The Channel Islands are stepping-stones towards France, in position and in language alike. They might become a medium through which France might learn a little more than she knows at present of England and the English. We are glad to see that a Magazine, simple, sound, and cheap—'L'Ámi de la Religion'—has sprung up in Jersey, printed in the French language, and conducted on English Church principles. It will, we hope, fall in with other efforts which are being made to dissipate the dense ignorance which exists abroad relative to Anglican Church claims, while its immediate use will be to supply wholesome reading to the natives of Jersey. It will doubtless command a limited circulation in England likewise.

Dr. Waddington, Dean of Durham, has reprinted (Murray) some lucubrations on the 'Greek Church,' which might have slept in the silence where they have reposed since 1829. The Dean thinks highly of his political sagacity in the suggestion that the Danubian provinces should have been committed to the tutelage of Austria. Some interesting and nicely written letters on the Strophades are the best part of this little volume.

The Bishop of Exeter's 'Pastoral Letter' (Murray) is among the thor's most important contributions to theology. Though occasional form, it will outlive the melancholy cause which made it necessary:

Rising with the gravity of his subject, the writer throws off, with a proud disdain, an ignoble subject of controversy; and if we miss some of the point of previous publications, the serenity and dignity of the composition more than atone for it. Like the great poet's Ulysses, the Bishop of Exeter—

> 'Though
> He is not now, that strength which in old days
> Moved earth and heaven—that which he is, he is:
> The equal temper of the heroic heart,
> Weaker by time and fate, but strong in will
> To strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield.'

Mr. Chenevix Trench's well-known work on Words, which we have already welcomed in these pages, showed him a thinker eminently qualified for discussing the nicer inflections of language. His 'Synonyms of the New Testament' (Macmillan) reach us in the form of a set of King's College Lectures; and both in scholarship and spirit they are creditable alike to the lecturer and his class.

Mr. Maurice's 'Ecclesiastical Lectures,' delivered to the same body, (Macmillan,) reach us so late in the quarter that we can only announce their publication.

There is nothing very novel in Mr. West's 'Figures and Types of the Old Testament,' (Masters,) but there is much that is amiable, sober, and reverential.

'Poor Paddy's Cabin,' (Wertheim,) is the production of an Irishman, who thinks that after the parables of Holy Scripture, comes first Bunyan, and then Mrs. Stowe. He only affects the third place. We do not propose to dispute his claims.

'Vestiges of Divine Vengeance,' (Wertheim,) is a succinct and comprehensive epitome of all that is known of the Dead Sea and its shores. The main object of Mr. W. E. Tyler's compilation was to make M. de Saulcy's discoveries more widely known, discoveries which we think are somewhat exaggerated. M. de Saulcy does not give the slightest archæological data for identifying the style or age of what he vaguely calls 'the ruins' of Gomorrha.

We find in 'Quelques Mots par un Chrétien Orthodoxe sur les Communions Orientales,' (Paris: Meyrueis,) a pamphlet which affects to be written by a Member of the Russian Church. If it be so, it is the first work which we remember emanating from the Oriental Communion which treats the schism between East and West, and the relations of the Reformed Communions together, in language and spirit departing from the old stereotyped antiquarian style. A Russian Montalembert or Du Maistre is a phenomenon.

Among Mr. Van Voorst's many beautiful books, none exceeds, we know not if any equals, the delicate beauty of Mr. Gosse's, 'The Aquarium.' The

writer, already most favourably known to the scientific and popular student, describes in this charming volume the processes by which he collects and preserves alive the mollusks and sea anemones, and kindred creatures, which in their cozy glass cases, those miniature ocean caves and jungles, form such a delightful spectacle in the Zoological Gardens. The cheapness and facility by which such an ornament of our rooms can be managed surprises us. The illustrations are of ravishing beauty—quite miracles of the art of tinted lithography. We know that this is high praise: but we cannot speak with less moderation on the subject. We have often had occasion to congratulate Mr. Gosse on his reverential style; we can therefore afford to say that he occasionally reflects—always, we admit, piously and nicely—over much.

'Points of War,' (Macmillan,) is the singular, perhaps affected, title of four most striking little poems by Mr. Franklin Lushington. They appeared in the *Morning Chronicle*, and have attracted much notice. They propose a musical as well as rhythmical effect. The 'Fleet under Sail' is an extraordinary little poem.

'Notanda, or, Things to be Remembered,' is the title of a useful tract published by Masters. It is a convenient because small compendium of doctrine, plainly and carefully compiled. It has been assailed in a wonderful tract No. 1. of 'Remarks,' by Rev. Thomas Whalley of Guernsey; and it has been defended by its author in a 'Letter in Defence, &c.' (Masters;) as well as by a Tract, 'The Truth of Things to be Remembered vindicated, &c.' (Masters.) Mr. Whalley does not approve the writings of Bishop Andrewes, and as Mr. Whalley wishes this to be known, we announce the fact on his behalf.

'Susanna,' and 'Ruth Osborne,' (Masters,) will be found convenient little gift-books for poor schools.

'The Old Black Oak,' (Skeffington,) is a conversation between a Lincolnshire Rector and a bit of bog oak. The Rector inquires whether Cain took refuge under the said oak when it was growing, also whether 'sweet birds of paradise did sing among thy topmost branches, and plume their feathers mid thy rich foliage?' We regret to say that the oak's communicativeness is not equal to the reverend querist's creditable spirit of inquiry.

Mr. Caswell's 'Western World Revisited,' (J. H. Parker,) is a reprint of the well-known letters which he forwarded, as 'our own correspondent,' to one of the daily papers when visiting the United States and Canada, as one of the deputation sent by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel to the American Board of Missions. The writer has done more in a simple, earnest, untiring way to bring the English and American Churches together than any man in England.

We cannot say much for 'Songs for the Church,' (Clarke;) they are rough and unelegant and homely: but they are, what much better verses often are not, readable.

A most convenient little series of Oxford classics, mere text books for e Lecture Room, is in course of publication by Mr. J. H. Parker. They

admirably supersede, and are cheaper than the vile Tauchnitz abominations of our own youth: at present the set only comprises the texts of the Greek Tragedians. Not being possessed of the classical fervour of Parson Adams, who always carried Æschylus in his pocket, may we ask for a Latin series?

We can promise young people who, like ourselves, relish 'The Conceited Pig' and other sage apologues of that sort, an immense treat in 'Stories on Proverbs,' (Mozley.) The title is not very happy: but the book is extremely funny and pleasant. We are strong enough to confess that we were weak enough to read this majestic volume quite through: and we suspect that the gravest of our readers, if we can persuade him to begin it, will do the same. The fact is, that very great art and skill is required, not only to make mice and owls and cocks and hens discourse in owl talk and the rest of it, but to discriminate in a mouse family, and to give each his or her special character. Pig character is one thing: but shading and tinting in the moral physiognomy of porklings is a rare acquirement. The present writer can do this.

'Consecration *versus* Desecration,' (Bell,) is the title of a very strong, yet respectful, remonstrance addressed to the Bishop of London, by one who obviously has both the right and power to speak strongly, on the plan for pulling down the City Churches.

'Mitslav, or the Conversion of Pomerania,' (Masters.) By the Rev. Robert Milman. The author of this little work is already not unknown to the public. To general literature he has contributed a Life of Tasso; to religion, several graceful allegories, and one or two devotional books. In the present volume, which gives an account of 'perhaps the most successful mission ever attempted and accomplished,' the historic and religious elements combine. The author has evidently taken great pains to collect all possible materials to make his history—for such, notwithstanding some slight interweaving of fiction, it really is—as complete as possible. To avoid, he tells us, all modern controversies, the narrative is supposed to come from the pen of Bernard, a monk, who, to console himself for the entire failure of his own labours in the same field, undertakes to give an account of the complete success attending the preaching of Otto, the rich, magnificent, yet personally self-denying Prince Bishop of Bamberg, high in favour with the Emperor Henry IV. Otto, instructed by Bernard's failure—a failure chiefly attributable to the contempt of the wealthy Pomeranians for his poverty (the poor monk had literally gone without purse or scrip)—takes measures to ensure a hearing, to attract notice and respect, and to satisfy the suspicious heathen that he has come seeking not theirs but them. So he comes with plenty of money, a numerous train of ecclesiastics and knights, materials for building and furnishing sumptuous churches. Of course, it is impossible in the limits of a notice to give even a sketch of the gradual steps by which Otto adds Pomerania to Christendom. His first immediate, almost miraculous success, crowned by the destruction with his own hand of the image of the chief false god Triglav, in his temple of Stettin; the rage of the heathen hierarchy, headed by Primislav, the

chief priest, almost as powerful in Pomerania as the temporal government, and their vain attempts to support their failing cause by pious frauds; the numerous apostasies, and in many places open re-establishment of idolatry, when Otto returns for a while to Bamberg, and great temporal calamities came on the people, ascribed, of course, by the heathen priests to the anger of the forsaken gods; the return and final triumph of Otto, when at last he wins to Christianity Mitslav, one of the most powerful nobles, who had long remained constant to the heathen party, (though even in Bernard's time he had protected the Christian missionaries from personal violence,) not so much from conviction as for love of Illah, the fair daughter of the high-priest, herself a priestess of Laden the Beautiful, goddess of Spring and of Love: the history of all this is well told, and will abundantly repay perusal. The two scenes in which the heathen priests have recourse to their pious frauds, which, of course, like all frauds, pious or otherwise, shamefully recoil on their own heads, are of dramatic interest. We specially recommend, too, the very striking account of the overwhelming temporal calamities that fall on the hitherto wealthy and prosperous Pomeranians, in the first year of their conversion, and the consequent numerous apostasies, to the consideration of those who see in national prosperity a sure sign of God's favour. The artifice of ascribing the narrative to Bernard is we think a failure. The Benedictine monk by no means conceals the Berkshire vicar. No one could for a moment give a mediæval religious credit for so calm and thoughtful a history as this, in which miracles, though by no means ignored, yet play a very undistinguished part, while the Blessed Virgin and saints are scarce ever mentioned, and the allusions to the Pope are of the remotest and vaguest kind. Perhaps, however, failure in the dramatic respect will not seriously affect the popularity and usefulness which 'Mitslav' deserves on other than artistic grounds.

Archbishop Whately has compiled, and Mr. J. W. Parker has published, a volume styled 'Remains of the late Bishop Copleston.' A creditable memoir of this respectable prelate had already appeared under the able but discriminating editorship of a near relation of the late Bishop. With this publication Dr. Whately is plainly dissatisfied: he is only thankful for the memoirs of any of his friends, so far as they illustrate his own life and writings. Dr. Whately has no objection to the portraits of his contemporaries and familiars; but every one of them must be depicted standing in ecstatic worship of Dr. Whately. Dr. Whately, we believe, has a full appreciation for all the literary remains of his Oriel friends, but then they must be those remains which enshrine or reflect the one beloved image of Dr. Whately himself. Dr. Whately surveys the whole world of thought and science with large and liberal glance: but it is not so much to inform and expand his own mind, as to detect all the points in which nature and learning illustrate and confirm the great Whateleian dicta. Aristotle and Bacon were the interpreters of nature: letters and books and men are noticeable and patronised only as they pay a deferential homage to and interpret the oracular sayings of the Archbishop of Dublin. It is with this broad

view of men and things that Dr. Whately has composed his Remains of Dr. Copleston. The proper title of the book would have been, 'Scraps of Whately with Copleston Sauce.' Dr. Whately quotes himself and his own numerous publications in the following pages of the volume before us:—in the Preface, p. vi.; p. 18, a quotation of nine pages from an unpublished manuscript of Dr. Whately; p. 35 *bis*; p. 48, a quotation of three pages; p. 51; p. 55; p. 56 *bis*; p. 57; pp. 58—63, five pages from another unpublished MS. epistle of Dr. Whately; p. 73; p. 75; p. 81; p. 83; p. 84, (four references to the *Opera Whateleiana*;) p. 89 *bis*; p. 92. At p. 96 commence the 'Remains' in the shape of 'Extracts' [very common-place indeed] 'from Dr. Copleston's Common-Place Book.' This Common-Place Book was, Dr. Whately informs us, 'transmitted at Dr. Copleston's desire to him as a bequest, with an evident design on his part that Dr. Whately should publish any portion of it which he considered generally interesting.' Now waiving the preliminary question, whether Bp. Copleston did not unwisely trust to his friend's friendship, and whether he intended to do more than to commit worthless adversaria to pious hands for incremation, it requires but small knowledge of Dr. Whately's character to anticipate the principle of selection which he would adopt. The object was to get together 'interesting extracts:' what on earth can be so interesting to the sons of men as Dr. Whately, and Dr. Whately's writings? Here is a convenient test and standard: what relates to, quotes, consults, praises, illustrates, or bows down to, Whately, is interesting. On this principle Bp. Copleston's Common-Place Book was consulted, on this principle it was eviscerated. The extracts from it only reach to twenty-five pages: but these twenty-five pages are illustrated by seven or eight apposite remarks from Dr. Whately, and one reference to Dr. Hinds. A dozen Sermons complete the 'Remains of Bishop Copleston,' and in editing these Archbishop Whately only quotes himself in the foot-notes thirteen times. The sum of the whole is that Dr. Whately quotes himself forty-one times in the volume. By way of specimen of the choicer and more instructive items of biography and contemporaneous history, with which Dr. Whately has enriched the memoir of his guide, philosopher, and friend, we extract the first fact on which the Archbishop expatiates:—'It is rather a curious coincidence that Bp. Copleston received the baptismal name of Edward; certainly without any reference to Oriel College, of which he afterwards became so distinguished an ornament, which college was founded by King Edward II.' As though one were to say, it is rather curious that Dr. Whately's name is Richard, certainly without any reference to Richard Crookback or Dick Turpin.

Mr. Tuckerman, an American traveller, has printed 'A Month in England,' (Bentley,) which has attracted quite as much praise as it deserves. Most of it is got up from 'Cunningham's Hand-Book of London,' the 'Oxford Guide,' and the like esoteric authorities. Mr. Tuckerman has made an awful mess of his sentiment, by going into great raptures at the Blue-Coat School, while idealizing the memories of Charterhouse worthies. He has confounded the two schools, and probably saw neither. *Ex. grat.* 'In that chamber [in the square of Christ's Hospital] the devout Baxter

expired,' p. 33. He died in Charterhouse Yard. Addison and Steele, Wesley and Barrow, all of whom Mr. Tuckerman surveys in his mind's eye pacing the Newgate Street cloisters, were at the Charterhouse, not at Christ's Hospital. Stillingfleet practised his first rhetoric at Cranbourne, in Dorsetshire, and not at the Blue Coat School. Blackstone was educated at the Charterhouse. Gazing up at the enormous roof of the hall of the same Christ's hospital, Mr. Tuckerman was reminded of C. Lamb's story of the donkey imprisoned on it: only the said hall was not built in Lamb's time. Mr. Tuckerman only seems to have gone to Church once during his month; and imagines that the supplications for the Queen are peculiar to S. George's Chapel, Windsor. He also opines that we ought not to beg for her Majesty's health and *wealth*, because the Gospel discourages riches. At Oxford Mr. Tuckerman is immensely pleased with the acacia-tree in front of Dr. Routh's lodgings at Magdalen: so pleased, indeed, that he invests it with tropical beauties, and spells it a 'cassia-tree.'

Mr. Cecil Wray's touching Memoir of Mr. Hughes, (Masters,) a young clergyman of promise, forms an agreeable volume: the subject is, however, hardly strong enough for biography.

'Hospitals and Sisterhoods,' (Murray,) groups together in a full and complete form, and with an excellent tone, all that recommends the revival and expansion of such institutions among ourselves.

The war has, of course, brought out a vast amount of religious writing: Tracts, Sermons, (chiefly preached on the Fast Day,) and disquisitions on and applications of unfulfilled prophecy. Among the Sermons, as sound and good, we may specify:—1. Mr. Acton Warburton's, preached at Iffley, (J. H. Parker.) 2. Mr. H. Newland's, a vigorous one, at Westbourne, (Masters.) 3. A remarkably eloquent one by Mr. E. Miller, preached at Bognor. 4. One by Mr. Sowter, (J. H. Parker.) 5. Mr. Kempe's at S. James's, (Skeffington.) 6. Mr. Gowring's, better than the average, at Banbury, (Masters.) 7. By Mr. Beamish, at Conduit Street, (Bosworth.) 'The Great Wine Press, popularly called Armageddon,' (Strange,) is a specimen of the coarse fanatical froth which a tormenting period of society brings up.

Of Sermons we have to acknowledge, 1. Kebbel's 'Harmony of the Sacraments,' (Bell.) 2. Huxtable's, preached at Wells before the Theological College, (J. W. Parker.) 3. Hugo's on 'The Lord's Prayer,' (Rivingtons;) and, 4, an admirable volume by Bishop Armstrong, (J. H. Parker.)

THE

CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

OCTOBER, 1854.

ART. I.—*History of Latin Christianity; including that of the Popes to the Pontificate of Nicolas V. By* HENRY HART MILMAN, D.D., Dean of St. Paul's. London: John Murray.

THE design of this work is to give a history of Christianity in the West, from its first origin to the latter part of the fifteenth century; when printing, the revival of letters, and Greek literature, produced a new world, intellectually, in Europe.

The three volumes now published bring down the history as far as the end of the twelfth century, when, after a series of strange reverses, the papal authority was fully established. The remainder of the work the author hopes to publish shortly.

The early portion of the history goes in part over the same ground as the History of Christianity down to the fall of Paganism, but is devoted more especially to the history of the Church of the West during that period; and particularly to those points which, in the author's opinion, influenced the development of the characteristic views and tone of religion manifested in the Latin Churches.

In several respects this history is likely to be much more interesting and more popular than Dr. Milman's former work. It is not concerned with a portion of Christian history which formed a prominent feature of that book—the life of our Lord, and the first beginnings of the Christian religion, recorded in the New Testament; so that the views of the writer are not brought into such painful collision with those of his readers as they were in each of his former histories. Again, the materials for the work are much more ample. We pass from the first centuries, of which the records are scanty, to those of which they are abundant, minute, and copious; and though the later ages may not be equal in point of Christian interest with the earlier, they have a special interest in their connexion with ourselves, and with the state in which Christianity came to us, and has been established among us. We read the history of the

foundation of our own Churches, and become acquainted with those ages into the treasures of whose teaching we have entered. Besides, this period will be found to afford great scope, and varied materials for those pictures and descriptions which the author produces so successfully, and opportunities for introducing abundant episodes of the most interesting kind, which set off the main subject when its own intrinsic interest is not great.

The history before us is not a philosophical history. The writer does not thoroughly and deeply trace the causes of the great facts of which he treats, or follow up the workings of the spirit of each age to its original springs; nor, again, is it a full narrative of facts. If you take any ordinary period of the history, and select the narrative of a writer the bulk of whose work would lead you to expect as copious a detail of events in the one as in the other, and compare the two, you learn less of what actually occurred from the History of the Dean of S. Paul's, than from writers whose works are in themselves less able and interesting than his. His work is not a chart, in which each point is set down in due proportion and exactness, but a series of pictures, so to say, of the country which it would describe. It is for this kind of composition that the poetical and somewhat gorgeous style of the author seems particularly to qualify him. Of course it is plain that such a composition is much the most interesting to the general reader. No one would think of taking up Gieseler as a book of pleasant reading; neither would one make that of Dr. Milman a book of reference for full and exact information. Indeed we think that this character has been carried so far as to destroy the due proportions of the history; so that the work assumes the character of a series of illustrations. In the portions, indeed, of history which it does undertake to represent fully, it is very exact and detailed. On the other hand, it omits facts, and passes very slightly over periods, which appear to be less suited for interesting narrative. Some series of events are set forth with the utmost fulness of detail—detail which adds interest to the narrative and vividness to the picture. But, to take one instance, there is no account of the circumstances of the introduction of the clause *Filioque* into the Creed, important as the fact is *doctrinally* in the history of the Latin Church in its relation to the Greek; whilst the controversies that occupied the Greek Church, and in which the Latins were only incidentally engaged, are treated with great fulness. Indeed, the points of doctrine and discipline, in which the Latins and Greeks are contrasted, are scarcely alluded to.

This history then has the defects, as well as the advantages, of such a kind of composition. The maker of a chart is bound to lay down in due proportion every place that comes within

any given line of importance. But the painter—one who would illustrate a country—selects his subject: he seizes the interesting objects; he passes hastily through dry, uniform tracts of country; he rarely draws the wide heath or the dull flat: whole districts are omitted, or are exhibited only in the dim remote distance of his picture, setting off the more engaging objects. Thus he selects the subject, and in handling that subject he chooses his own position towards it. Faithfulness, indeed, requires that his pictures should not only be individually truthful, but that collectively they should give a fair idea of the country; but yet in each he may take his own point of view. The lights and shades are thrown as they will best please the eye, or bring out those features of the landscape that are most telling. Some objects stand out in vivid reality; others are thrown into the shade, and are as if they were not. Of some portions, each minute detail is worked up with the utmost care, whilst others exhibit scarcely any distinct features. Thus the present historian has been most exact in his working out of particular points. Mahommedanism is traced from its first commencement, and the life and system of the false prophet beautifully described. The contentions on various points of doctrine —the Monothelite and Iconoclastic—which chiefly belong to the history of the Greek Church, are dwelt on at great length, and with great copiousness of detail. The history of Christianity in our own country, especially the history of S. Thomas of Canterbury, is portrayed with a fulness which neither its interest to ourselves, nor (which is the reason assigned in the latter case) its being so remarkable an exhibition of the religious temper of the age, does so well account for as the fact that they afforded good subjects for description, and studies most interesting to the reader. In all these cases the minuteness of detail is what gives the truth, reality, and beauty, to the narrative. We do not quarrel with it; we have enjoyed reading it; but it is plain that, in a history extending over twelve centuries, very much must be passed over lightly to allow so large a space for these special subjects. While Becket's history is drawn out with this elaborate handling, that of Lanfranc and Anselm is barely touched on.

But this pictorial character makes Dr. Milman's history more generally engaging and likely to interest his readers, and it is as a decoy to the study of Church history that we think it is likely to prove most valuable, especially to that of the Middle Ages.

These volumes give a charm to a period of the Church's history which is generally but little studied, and too often regarded as a desert. The common practice of ordinary theological students was (perhaps still is) to read the Church History

of the first three or four centuries, and then to pass on to that of the Reformation. They took the portions of the Church's existence the decisions of which are regarded as authoritative. The intervening portion—a thousand or twelve hundred years, the greater portion of the duration of our religion—was neglected; and, because it was neglected and unknown, was supposed to be unprofitable.

It is through this supposed desert that Dean Milman leads us, and shows us that it is really a country full of fair scenes and objects of deep interest. The impression given by the bare recital of barbarian inroads—the long, puzzling, uninteresting successions of the Merovingian, and, except the noble founders of the house, of the Carlovingian princes—lists of Popes who have nothing to distinguish them—the aspect under which the history of this period is usually presented, simply deters one from engaging in it, and persons turn away from it as a fruitless study. The History before us shows that this is an unfair impression: that that long range of years has objects of great beauty, noble characters, stirring events, strange intricacies of plots, great and unlooked-for changes for good and evil. Thus an interest is thrown over the period which, to general readers, it did not possess before.

And it is a period in many respects most instructive. There is a life and energy, a self-devotion, and simple acting out of Christian principles, in the recently converted of the northern nations, which exemplifies what Christians should be. The labours, the zeal, the course of proceeding adopted by the missionaries, are full of instruction; and in one respect the study of this portion of Church history is most especially necessary—in that it exhibits the original of the present relation of the Church and the civil power.

We study the history of the Church while the civil governments of the world were heathen, and the Christians were persecuted; as soon as we come to the time when the Church was established—to a condition of things parallel to and capable of comparison with our own—we leave it. The consequence is obvious: we only see the primitive Christians in their state of independence and separation from, or antagonism to, the civil power; we are in danger of either inferring hastily that we ought to act in the same manner, and learning nothing else than lessons of independence and antagonism—or of concluding that the condition of things at present is so different that no inference can be drawn from those times to our own, and hence acquiescing in a fusion of the Church in the State. But the history of the Church in the centuries that follow the establishment of Christianity as the recognised religion of the State, is fruitful in every form of warning, and example, and suggestion. We may

see almost every form of relation arising between Church and State; we can trace the consequences to which they led; we can study the arguments on which they were maintained. Nay, more, we see what varied forms of this relation are compatible with the Church's life, have retarded, or stimulated and advanced it. We may here test our theories by experience—too often a sad and melancholy experience, it is true, but yet the more calculated to save us from despairing under difficulties, or imagining that the Church has lost her vitality or her power because she does not yet enjoy her freedom.

How infinitely valuable are the lessons which those ten or twelve centuries teach us! The struggles, the depression, the seeming failure, of the cause of truth and goodness—its revival in increased energy, and life, and power.

Yet these most useful fields of instruction are commonly unexamined. Some slight sketch, some brief compendium, some meagre list of names and dates, is regarded as sufficient—a mere verbal acquaintance with it, without at all entering into the realities of the life of those who existed in those days, their views or actions, reverses or successes.

The volumes before us are well fitted to work a change in this respect among general readers. They are themselves interesting and attractive—and show how much there is worth knowing in the Church history of those ages. The style of composition adopted specially fits them for this use. The language is always graceful, often eloquent; though tending to over-gorgeousness of diction, and to a uniform brilliancy, which detracts much from the effect, as well as from the clearness of the style.

There is another characteristic of the author's mode of treating the subject, which, however distasteful it may be to our feelings, and in a certain sense unfair, has its use. He looks on the subject from without, and writes the history of Christianity in a critical and judicial attitude, which is as though it were apart from the society of whose fate he treats.

Hence the subject is not treated as ecclesiastical history usually is. It deals much more largely with the general history of the times; and endeavours to represent persons and events, not as viewed by the members of the Church themselves, but as seen by the world. Prevalent faults and evils are put prominently in view; sometimes—as it would seem for the sake of giving weight to the view less generally received—too prominently. But this mode of treatment has its advantages, if it be kept in mind that it is only a view of one side of the subject. We need to have such a view presented to us.

Ecclesiastical history, generally speaking, is exclusively ecclesiastical. It is treated as a special branch of history, like the

their ends, disappointments occurring by the way, and disappointments coming at the last; life-long struggles, mutual distrust, misrepresentation of conduct, and imputation of bad motives:—the same troubles which are now the lot of those who are willing to leave the calm and too often the selfish quiet of doing only their own work, for the service of God and His truth, have been the portion of good men in all times.

But most of all, and most dangerously, are we deceived when we frame to ourselves an ideal of what the Church of Christ should be—drawing out an image of perfection which never has been, and never is to be, actually realized. Such an ideal is useful if it be set before us as a model towards the attaining and carrying out of which our endeavours should be directed. It is a mistake if we expect ever actually to see it realized, and still more, if, because it is not realized, we relax our energies, or acquiesce in a lower state of things, or despond of doing anything because we cannot do everything, or suppose that a church is not a true church because it does not come up to this ideal. Such an error was that of the Montanists, the Donatists, the various sects which, in the Middle Ages, aimed at purity by severing themselves from the Church. In our own days it leads persons to listen to the claims of Irvingism, or to go over to Rome, or altogether to give up the belief in the Church as a visible Divine institution.

In the great majority of instances among ourselves these errors have clearly arisen from indulging in the dream of finding this ideal perfection of the Church actually realized. The reaction produces a feeling of dissatisfaction with what is actual, and a starting aside, or starting back, into some form of error.

One of the best remedies for this evil is to make oneself acquainted with the state of the Church as it really did exist at any, even at the brightest, periods of its course. A thoughtful study of the Acts of the Apostles or the Epistles of S. Paul, and a realizing the actual condition of the Church in those days, would show us much in this way. And hence it follows that to a right-minded man the study of a history which gives (suppose it) too unfavourable a view of the Church of past times, may prove useful; just as moralists recommend us to make use of calumnies as hints, to aid in discovering our own faults.

When an author brings out the faults of great men—when he seems to us not to entertain a just view of their characters—not to understand them—when he shows that they were not understood by those of their own time—he is but exhibiting that which is the common lot of all; specially of all who rise above the ordinary every-day line of principle and conduct, and are not understood because they are not actuated by the principles that sway the minds of the masses.

Now the view which Dr. Milman takes of the history of Christianity in the world—as it leads generally to fairness in the statement of facts, and impartiality as well as calmness in depicting the opinions and characters of the Christians of former ages, does also somewhat disqualify him from entering into their characters, and realizing the principles that were at work; and gives to his generally impartial mind some bias against those who were earnest in their day in maintaining religious truth, and opposing the practices and principles of the world.

The view we refer to is that respecting the modification of Christianity by the habits of mind and thought—the civilization, information, and intellectual advancement—of the age or country in which it exists. He regards it as so modified that the religion is the fruit of the spirit of the age, and is exactly adapted to the age. Hence certain opinions and practices belong to each age, and any other would be out of place in it. It would seem, indeed, as if there were no truth, and that what each age troweth is truth to that age. That there is some truth—something which constitutes Christianty, simply as such—something which lives in and through all these variations, the author certainly holds; but what it is—how much of what we consider properly Christianity is included in it—he does not state explicitly. He considers the three great forms of Christianity to be the Greek, the Latin, and that which began at the Reformation, Teutonic Christianity; and draws out the characteristics of each form, and contrasts them with each other, at the opening of his work;—

'Greek Christianity could not be but affected, both in its doctrinal progress and in its polity, by its Greek origin. Among the Greeks had been for centuries agitated all those primary questions which lie at the bottom of all religions:—the formation of the worlds—the existence and nature of the Deity—the origin and cause of evil, though this seems to have been studied even with stronger predilection in the trans-Euphratic East. Hence Greek Christianity was insatiably inquisitive, speculative. Confident in the inexhaustible copiousness and fine precision of its language, it endured no limitation to its curious investigations. As each great question was settled or worn out, it was still ready to propose new ones. It began with the Divinity of Christ (still earlier perhaps with some of the Gnostic Cosmogonical, or Theophanic theories), so onward to the Trinity; it expired, or at least drew near its end, as the religion of the Roman East, discussing the Divine Light on Mount Tabor.

'In their polity the Grecian Churches were a federation of republics, as were the settlements of the Jews. But they were founded on a religious, not on a national basis; external to, yet in their boundaries, mostly in their aggregative system, following the old commonwealths, which still continued to subsist under the supremacy of the Roman Prefect or Proconsul, and in later times the distribution of the Imperial dioceses. They were held together by common sympathies, common creeds, common sacred books, certain, as yet simple, but common rites, common usages of life, and an hierarchy everywhere, in theory at least, of the same power and

influence. They admitted the Christians of other places by some established sign, or by recommendatory letters. They were often bound together by mutual charitable subventions. Still each was an absolutely independent community. The Roman East, including Greece, had no capital. The old kingdoms might respect the traditionary greatness of some city, which had been the abode of their kings, or which was the seat of a central provincial government: other cities, from their wealth and population, may have assumed a superior rank, Antioch in Syria, Alexandria in Egypt, Ephesus in Asia Minor. But though churches known or reputed to have been founded by Apostles might be looked on with peculiar respect, there was as yet no subordination, no supremacy; their federal union was a voluntary association. Whether the internal constitution had become more or less rapidly or completely monarchical; whether the Bishop had risen to a greater or less height above his co-Presbyters, the whole episcopal order, the representatives of each church, were on the same level. The Metropolitan, and afterwards the Patriarchal dignity, was of later growth. Jerusalem, which might naturally have aspired to the rank of the Christian capital, at least of the East, had been destroyed, and remained desolate for many years: it assumed only at a later period (at one time it was subject to Cæsarea) even the Patriarchal rank.

'But at the extinction of Paganism, Greek, or as it may now be called in opposition to the West, Eastern Christianity, had almost ceased to be aggressive or creative. Except the contested conversion of the Bulgarians, later of the Russians, and a few wild tribes, it achieved no conquests. The Nestorians alone, driven into exile by cruel persecutions, formed settlements, and propagated their own form of Christianity in Persia, India, perhaps in still more distant lands. The Eastern Church never recovered the ground which it had lost before the revived Magianism of the Sassanian kings of Persia; and it was compelled to retire within still narrowing bounds before triumphant Mohammedanism. The Greek hierarchy had now lost their unity of action. The great Patriarchates, which by this time had been formed on the authority of Councils, were involved in perpetual strife, or were contested by rival bishops, till three of them, Antioch, Alexandria, Jerusalem, sank into administrators of a tolerated religion under the Mohammedan dominion. The Bishop of Constantinople was the passive victim, the humble slave, or the factious adversary of the Byzantine Emperor: rarely exercised a lofty moral control upon his despotism. The lower clergy, whatever their more secret beneficent or sanctifying workings on society, had sufficient power, wealth, rank, to tempt ambition, or to degrade to intrigue; not enough to command the public mind for any great salutary purpose, to repress the inveterate immorality of an effete age; to reconcile jarring interests, to mould together hostile races: in general they ruled, where they did rule, by the superstitious fears, rather than by the reverence and attachment of a grateful people. They sank downward into the common ignorance, and yielded to that worst barbarism—a worn out civilization. Monasticism withdrew a great number of those who might have been energetic and useful citizens into barren seclusion, and religious indolence; but except where the monks formed themselves, as they frequently did, into fierce political or polemic factions, they had little effect on the condition of society. They stood aloof from the world, the anchorites in their desert wildernesses, the monks, in their jealously barred convents; and secure, as they supposed, of their own salvation, left the rest of mankind to inevitable perdition.

'Greek theology still maintained its speculative tendency; it went on defining with still more exquisite subtlety the Godhead and the nature of Christ; the interminable controversy still lengthened out, and cast forth

sect after sect from the enfeebled community. The great Greek writers, Athanasius, Basil, the Gregories, had passed away, and left only unworthy successors; the splendid public eloquence had expired on the lips of Chrysostom. There was no writer who laid strong hold on the imagination or reason of men, except the author of that extraordinary book, ascribed to Dionysius the Areopagite, of which perhaps the remote influence was greater in the West than in the Byzantine empire. John of Damascus, the powerful adversary of Iconoclasm, is a splendid exception, not merely on account of the polemic vigour shown in that controversy, but as a theologian doubtless the ablest of his late age. The Greek language gradually, but slowly, degenerated; at length, but not entirely till after the fall of Constantinople, it broke up into barbarous dialects; but it gave birth by fusion with foreign tongues to no new language productive of noble poetry, of oratory, or philosophy. A rude and premature reformation, that of Iconoclasm, attempted to overthrow the established traditionary faith; but offered nothing to supply its place, which could either enlighten the mind or enthral the religious affections: it destroyed the images, but it did not reveal the Original Deity, or the Christ in his pure and essential spirituality. Greek Christianity remained however, and still remains, a separate and peculiar form of faith; it repudiated all the attempts of the feebler sovereigns of the East to barter its independence for succour against the formidable Turks: it is still the religion of revived Greece, and of the vast Russian empire.

'Latin Christianity, on the other hand, seemed endowed with an inexhaustible principle of expanding life. No sooner had the Northern tribes entered within its magic circle, than they submitted to its yoke: and, not content with thus conquering its conquerors, it was constantly pushing forward its own frontier, and advancing into the strongholds of Northern Paganism. Gradually it became a monarchy, with all the power of a concentrated dominion. The clergy assumed an absolute despotism over the mind of man: not satisfied with ruling princes and kings, themselves became princes and kings. Their organization was coincident with the bounds of Christendom; they were a second universal magistracy, exercising always equal, asserting, and for a long period possessing, superior power to the civil government. They had their own jurisprudence—the canon law—co-ordinate with and of equal authority with the Roman or the various national codes, only with penalties infinitely more terrific, almost arbitrarily administered, and admitting no exception, not even that of the greatest temporal sovereign. Western Monasticism, in its general character, was not the barren, idly laborious or dreamy quietude of the East. It was industrious and productive: it settled colonies, preserved arts and letters, built splendid edifices, fertilized deserts. If it rent from the world the most powerful minds, having trained them by its stern discipline, it sent them back to rule the world. It continually, as it were, renewed its youth, and kept up a constant infusion of vigorous life, now quickening into enthusiasm, now darkening into fanaticism; and by its perpetual rivalry, stimulating the zeal, or supplying the deficiencies of the secular clergy. In successive ages it adapted itself to the state of the human mind. At first a missionary to barbarous nations, it built abbeys, hewed down forests, cultivated swamps, enclosed domains, retrieved or won for civilization tracts which had fallen to waste or had never known culture. With St. Dominic it turned its missionary zeal upon Christianity itself, and spread as a preaching order throughout Christendom; with St. Francis it became even more popular, and lowered itself to the very humblest of mankind. In Jesuitism it made a last effort to govern mankind by an incorporated caste. But Jesuitism found it necessary to reject many of the pecu-

liarities of Monasticism: it made itself secular to overcome the world. But the compromise could not endure. Over the Indians of South America alone, but for the force of circumstances, it might have been lasting. In Eastern India it became a kind of Christian Paganism: in Europe a moral and religious Rationalism, fatal both to morals and to religion.

'Throughout this period, then, of at least ten centuries, Latin Christianity was the religion of the Western nations of Europe: Latin the religious language; the Latin translation of the Scriptures the religious code of mankind. Latin theology was alone inexhaustibly prolific, and held wide and unshaken authority. On most speculative tenets this theology had left to Greek controversialists to argue out the endless transcendental questions of religion, and contented itself with resolutely embracing the results, which she fixed in her inflexible theory of doctrine. The only controversy which violently disturbed the Western Church was the practical one, on which the East looked almost with indifference, the origin and motive principle of human action—grace and free will. This, from Augustine to Luther and Jansenius, was the interminable, still reviving problem. Latin Christian literature, like Greek, might have seemed already to have passed its meridian after Tertullian, Cyprian, Ambrose, and, high above all, Augustine. The age of true Latin poetry, no doubt, had long been over; the imaginative in Christianity could only find its expression to some extent in the legend and in the ritual; but, except in a very few hymns, it was not till out of the wedlock of Latin with the Northern tongues, not till after new languages had been born in the freshness of youth, that there were great Christian poets: poets not merely writing on religious subjects, but instinct with the religious life of Christianity—Dante, Ariosto, Tasso, Shakspeare, Milton, Calderon, Schiller. But not merely did Latin theology expand into another vast and teeming period, that of the Schoolmen, culminating in Aquinas; but Latin being the common language, the clergy the only learned body throughout Europe, it was that of law, in both its branches; of science, of philosophy, even of history; of letters; in short, of civilization. Latin Christianity, when her time was come, had her great era of art, not only as the preserver of the traditions of Greek and Roman skill in architecture, and some of the technical operations in sculpture and painting, but original and creative. It was art comprehending architecture, painting, sculpture, and music, Christian in its fullest sense, as devoted entirely to Christian uses, expressive of Christian sentiments, arising out of and kindling in congenial spirits Christian thought and feeling.

'The characteristic of Latin Christianity was that of the old Latin world—a firm and even obstinate adherence to legal form, whether of traditionary usage or written statute; the strong assertion of, and the severe subordination to authority. Its wildest and most eccentric fanaticism, for the most part, and for many centuries, respected external unity. It was the Roman empire, again extended over Europe by an universal code and a provincial government; by an hierarchy of religious prætors or proconsuls, and a host of inferior officers, each in strict subordination to those immediately above them, and gradually descending to the very lowest ranks of society: the whole with a certain degree of freedom of action, but a constrained and limited freedom, and with an appeal to the spiritual Cæsar in the last resort.

'Latin Christianity maintained its unshaken dominion until, what I venture to call, Teutonic Christianity, aided by the invention of paper and of printing, asserted its independence, threw off the great mass of traditionary religion, and out of the Bible summoned forth a more simple faith, which seized at once on the reason, on the conscience, and on the passions of men. This faith, with a less perfectly organized outward system, has

exercised a more profound moral control, through the sense of strictly personal responsibility. Christianity became a vast influence working irregularly on individual minds, rather than a great social system, coerced by a central supremacy, by an all-embracing spiritual control, and held together by rigid usage, or by outward signs of common citizenship. Its multiplicity and variety, rather than its unity, was the manifestation of its life; or rather its unity lay deeper in its being, and consisted more in intellectual sympathies, in affinities of thought and feeling, of principles and motives, in a more remote or rather untraceable kindred through the common Father and common Saviour. Ceremonial uniformity seemed to retire into subordinate importance and estimation. Books gradually became, as far as the instruction of the human race, a co-ordinate priesthood. No longer rare, costly, inaccessible, or unintelligible, they descended to classes which they had never before approached. Eloquence or argument, instead of expiring on the ears of an entranced but limited auditory, addressed mankind at large, flew through kingdoms, crossed seas, perpetuated and promulgated themselves to an incalculable extent. Individual men could not but be working out in their own studies, in their own chambers, in their own minds, the great problems of faith. The primal records of Christianity, in a narrow compass, passed into all the vernacular languages of the world, where they could not be followed by the vast, scattered, and ambiguous volumes of tradition. The clergy became less and less a separate body (the awakened conscience of men refused to be content with vicarious religion through them); they ceased to be the sole arbiters of man's destiny in another life: they sank back into society, to be distinguished only as the models and promoters of moral and religious virtue, and so of order, happiness, peace, and the hope of immortality. They derived their influence less from a traditionary divine commission, or vested authority, than from their individual virtue, knowledge, and earnest, if less authoritative, inculcation of divine truth. Monasticism was rejected as alien to the primal religion of the Gospel; the family life, the life of the Christian family, resumed its place as the highest state of Christian grace and perfection.

'This progressive development of Christianity seems the inevitable consequence of man's progress in knowledge, and in the more general dissemination of that knowledge. Human thought is almost compelled to assert, and cannot help asserting, its original freedom. And as that progress is manifestly a law of human nature, proceeding from the divine Author of our being, this self-adaptation of the one true religion to that progress must have the divine sanction, and may be supposed, without presumption, to have been contemplated in the counsels of Infinite Wisdom.'—Vol. i. pp. 2—10.

The following note shows how far the author would allow the name of Christianity to extend:—

'It is obvious that I use Christianity, and indeed Teutonic Christianity, in its most comprehensive significance, from national episcopal churches, like that of England, which aspires to maintain the doctrines and organization of the apostolic, or immediately post-apostolic ages, onward to that dubious and undefinable verge where Christianity melts into a high moral theism, a faith which would expand to purer spirituality with less distinct dogmatic system; or that which would hardly call itself more than a Christian philosophy, a religious Rationalism. I presume not, neither is it the office of the historian, to limit the blessings of our religion either in this *world or* the world to come; "there is One who will know his own." As an

historian I can disfranchise none who claim, even on the slightest grounds, the privileges and hopes of Christianity: repudiate none who do not place themselves without the pale of believers and worshippers of Christ, or of God through Christ.'—Vol. i. p. 9, *note.*

In other words, the Teutonic element eliminates the Christian. It is quite true that as is the spirit of each age and race, such is the spirit of the religion that prevails; whether it be in its conformity to the general tendencies of the time, or in its opposition to it. The relaxed effeminacy of the Byzantine Empire, had, as its opposing principle, the severity of Stylites. But it is plain that we may conceive the spirit of the age influencing its Christianity so much as to make it cease to be in any true sense Christianity at all. And, short of this, it may modify it so as to make it widely different from true Christianity. This 'Christianity' of an age or country is the 'Christianity' of the many, though influencing in some degree, probably, all that are within its sphere.

Yet we must observe that the features of this 'Christianity' are, generally speaking, exaggerations of points that are really portions of the Christian system: and that the very existence of the exaggeration implies the preexistence of that of which it is an exaggeration; *e.g.* The sacerdotal principle may be exaggerated in Latin Christianity, yet the principle itself be an original part of the Christian scheme. Former ages ran into excesses and absurdities in asceticism; but the ascetic principle itself is an element of the religion as taught and practised by our Lord and His Apostles.

There is something which constitutes Christianity absolutely. There are facts and doctrines which form its essence; facts which occurred and are recorded as the basis of its visible and historical manifestation—doctrines which were taught by those who founded it as constituting that faith which made persons to be Christians—which made them truly such, in opposition alike (to take the earliest period) to those who rejected the name, and therein the facts, and to those who, while they assumed the name, rejected the faith, or explained or mysticised away the facts: and these were numerous, almost within the lifetime of the first preachers of the religion, and were regarded by them as Christians, 'falsely so called.' This body of facts and doctrines, which has a being and reality, independently of its being received and believed—independently of the particular minds in which it exists subjectively—when so received is modified in some degree by the spirit of him who receives it, still more by the spirit of the classes, or ages, or nations, in which it exists. But it is never to be forgotten that it has its own independent truth, and that it is in virtue of this, its absolute character, that it

continually manifests its own distinctness, and vindicates its authority, as something separate from, and above the opinions and tastes, and views of men. How many a case is there in which the Christianity of the individual (for we shall find in the man the epitome of the Church) is so modified by his own habitual view of its doctrines and rules, that it becomes an easy sort of religion, losing all its own bright characteristics, till some wrench of mind—some sudden overwhelming affliction—the perception of the truth put in some striking way—dispels his dreams, and Christianity as it really is stands before him in its evidence and reality, and claims and receives submission. So it is with the ages of the world. Analyse each age indeed—pass from the rough and general view of the world of any time, to the numberless portions of which it consists, and which have each their own 'Christianity,' the Christianity, say—for we do not use Dean Milman unfairly in so illustrating the principle on which he applies the term Teutonic Christianity to 'a high moral Theism'—the Christianity of those classes of people who live by dishonest arts, of the London poor, of men deeply immersed in commerce, of 'men about town,' of men of science and literature, of ecclesiastics, of women; each of these on a small scale is a 'Christianity.' So you have Wesleyan Christianity, Quaker Christianity, Presbyterian, Anglican, Roman Christianity; each has a tone, a savour of its own. Pass from these to the Christianity of a country. You find that each has its characteristics. English Christianity (if we can imagine it abstracted from our numerous forms) would have marks that distinguish it from German or French Christianity. French and Spanish Christianity would be contrasted. So, in earlier ages, we may distinguish a special tone and mode of viewing Christian truth in the African, Alexandrian, Syrian Churches; and in each class or school within the scope of the Christian name. So again each age, say of Latin Christianity, has its own characteristics—the earlier times of Augustine and Ambrose, the Middle Age, the modern. It is the delight of one whose theory or whose work leads him that way to dwell on these points of contrast, to depict each strongly in its own characteristics, until they come to appear as so many different religions.

Yet Christian truth—in its independent, absolute form, as it exists free from the conceptions of men—meaning by Christian truth the facts, the doctrines, the morality, all that was done and taught by the original Founder of our religion—has a life and power which it has continually shown, in that it is itself the life of all that is Christian in these varying forms, and is continually counteracting those tendencies in them which are different from itself, and from time to time rising up, as

it were, and casting them out. What are those revivals of religion which, from age to age, have, with might irresistible, reversed the whole mass of popular religionism, immediately influencing the few, and ultimately making the tone of the Christianity that prevails in a country different from what it was? What truths of faith and practice there are which had been overlooked, or viewed amiss, by the spirit of the age; which vindicate their own independent being and power, by revolutionising that which seemed to have occupied their place! Our own days and our own Church have witnessed the beginning of such a change; who knows what may be its end?

The tendency of such a view as Dr. Milman's is to lead us to lose sight of an absolute Christianity; and the process by which this is to be counteracted is, by observing the substantial identity of Church Christianity at least, in all ages and all branches of the Church. As on the one hand, the unity of the Christian faith has been preserved, amongst other human instrumentalities, by the influence of different portions of the Church mutually checking each other—each of which, left alone, might have aberrated beyond the limits of truth; but which, acting on each other, as members of one Catholic Church, have steadied the whole—so is the unity of faith which is found in Christians of different ages, races, circumstances, the simplest evidence of the oneness of the religion—the proof that there is a truth of the Gospel independent of opinion, to which all these bear their testimony. Just as we argue the reality of moral truth, by finding a oneness in it underlying all the varied colouring of individual or class peculiarities, so—besides that distinct and most certain evidence which we derive from the written records of the first founders of our religion, and the historical testimony to the truths which they taught—we argue it from this unity underlying the variations. And this is to be judged of, not by extracts selected to maintain a theory—designed to exhibit the points of contrast between one age and another, or one writer and another—but by that which forms the body and substance of their writings—the very texture, as it were, of which they are composed. Let any one read the sermons of Chrysostom, or Gregory, or Bernard; he will find in them not only full as much identity of tone as, but a greater identity than, he will find in the productions of different schools of divines in the Church of England.

We have touched on these points, because there is a great danger of overrating the influence of local or temporary influences in modifying the faith. The subject is, however, far too extensive, and goes too deep, to be at all adequately treated here.

It is, however, the favourite view of the writer of this History,

that the doctrines held in each period are a modification of opinions belonging to, and influenced by, those various causes peculiar to the time, such as race, intelligence, general culture, national character, which modify other opinions. The effect, on the whole, is a greater impartiality in the representation of the views and temper that prevailed in past ages than we usually meet with. He is neither a panegyrist of the Ages of Faith, nor yet interested in exhibiting the marks of Antichrist. He looks on calmly at the phenomena which discover themselves, and portrays them fairly. He has no temptation to do otherwise. They are to him phases of human sentiment appropriate to that age, which an historian would endeavour to depict as faithfully as the literature or the dress of the same period. Those who regard the doctrinal decisions of the Church as of present authority, or are interested from controversial causes in thinking the Christians of those days better or worse than they were, are under a temptation to bend the facts to suit their own theory. But the author of this work has no such temptation: he looks calmly on; he regards contests about doctrines as quarrels about words or unimportant niceties; he delights to represent the opinions generally received as characteristic pictures of the life of those times. Read, for instance, the following passage, in which the history of the disputes on the Eucharist is introduced:—

'This Sacrament—the Eucharist—from the earliest times had withdrawn into the most profound mystery; it had been guarded with the most solemn reverence, shrouded in the most impressive ceremonial. It had become as it were the Holy of Holies of the religion, in which the presence of the Godhead was only the more solemn from the surrounding darkness. That Presence had as yet been unapproached by profane and searching controversy, had been undefined by canon, neither agitated before Council, nor determined by Pope. During all these centuries no language had been thought too strong to express the overpowering awe and reverence of the worshippers. The oratory of the pulpit and the hortatory treatise had indulged freely in the boldest images; the innate poetry of the faith had worked those images into realities. Christ's real Presence was in some indescribable manner in the Eucharist; but under the notion of the real Presence might meet conceptions the most dissimilar, ranging from the most subtle spiritualism to the most gross materialism; that of those whose faith would be as profoundly moved by the commemorative symbols, which brought back upon the memory in the most vivid reality the one sacrifice upon the cross; as that of the vulgar, to whom the more material the more impressive the notion, to whom the sacred elements would be what the fetiche is to the savage.

'Between these two extremes would be the great multitude of believers, who would contemplate the whole subject with remote and reverential awe. To these the attempt at the scrutiny, or even the comprehension of the mystery, would appear the height of profane presumption; yet their intuitive apprehension would shrink on the one hand from refining the holy bread and wine into mere symbols, on the other from that transubstantia-

tion which could not but expose the actual Godhead to all the accidents to which those elements, not now merely corporeal, and with all the qualities of the human flesh and blood, but actually deified, might be subject. It was the fatal term Transubstantiation, first used by Paschasius Radbert, a monk of Corvey, which startled some of the more reflective minds; according to this term the elements ceased entirely to be what they still seemed to be to the outward senses. The substance of the bread and wine was actually annihilated—nothing existed but the body and blood of the Redeemer, the body and blood of the Redeemer resuscitated in the flesh, yet to which belonged the ubiquity, the eternity of the divine nature.'—Vol. iii. pp. 20—22.

In the same way he regards monks and self-denying missionaries as a part of the age; and whilst he has no mercy on Eastern Monachism, and, in treating of it, loses the gift of sympathy, and the power, as it seems, of entering into the spirit which really prompted men to lives of self-denial—real, indeed, however exaggerated—he finds in Western Monachism a power and energy—a real influence exercised over the world and a turn given to its affairs—a nobleness and heroism in the characters of individual members of the class, which awakens his admiration, and calls forth some of his most eloquent descriptions.

Still Dr. Milman dislikes these ascetics. That is very plain. And he dislikes those who did not think that Christian truths were modes of sentiment, or the distinctions of truth and error minute verbal differences. Men who sacrificed quiet, home, the regard of friends, the satisfactions of life, nay, life itself, to maintain or propagate a doctrine, cannot be understood by one who thinks doctrines phases of opinion. They seem mere hinderers of the natural progress of things, or violent anticipators of it.

And yet whatever theorists may say of the natural progress of opinion or of social changes—for the two cases are parallel—supposing that, upon their own showing, states go through a series of changes, and that the general progress or decline of thought and reason produces a corresponding change in the religious opinions entertained—very little consideration shows us that it still depends, humanly speaking, on individual energy, whether the current is made to flow in one direction or another, and that doctrines influence the temper of a people just as much as their temper influences the doctrine. Will any one maintain that it was unimportant to the Church's temper whether the Catholic or the Arian doctrine was established in the fourth century? Or that there was any such sympathy of national character with one set of opinions rather than the other, as that France might not have had the Huguenot as the established religion instead of the Catholic? and would France in that case have been what France is now? or Ireland, had it been Protestant; or Scotland, had it been Catholic? Individual men are the instruments by which great changes are

carried out, or great truths maintained, whether in politics or religion. They give a direction to the current, and it flows on steadily in the course on which they have started it; whether it be that they are the foremost in effecting those changes which the times require, or in withstanding the evil spirit which rules their age. For the great man has to oppose his age, though in after times he seems to lead it. Athanasius, Augustine, Anselm, Bernard—all had lives of contention. We say this, because the practical inference from the notion of the doctrines belonging to the age is, that you may sit at home, leave such matters alone, and they will shape themselves aright; and that the spirit of the age, whatever that may be, must prevail; and that those who have, in past or present times, taken the course of energetically maintaining the truth, are 'troublers of Israel.'

Our theorists cannot enter into the minds of such men, or appreciate them. If there are manifest faults of character in any one, his earnestness for religious doctrine is at once condemned as a mere excuse for personal quarrels or party aggrandisement; and, as in S. Cyril of Alexandria, no language of reproach appears too stern. If the character be otherwise good, this feature, with all allied to it, is regarded as a flaw—the child and parent of evil. Bernard's sanctity is suspected when he opposes Abelard; and candour—the disposition not to judge unfavourably without manifest cause—is suspended in his case.

The same persons, when treating of religious wars as a phase of a certain age, and so more favourably than ordinary historians, yet seem not to perceive that it is war itself which is evil; and that war for revenge, or ambition, or liberty, or to gain or protect commercial advantages—however it may be necessary from the present condition of mankind—is quite as unjustifiable as war undertaken for the protection of religious privileges or securing the profession of Christianity. The example of the primitive Christians, in not taking up arms for their own defence or security, should be followed consistently. The impartiality, or *adiaphory*, of the Dean, makes him, in these respects, hard on those who, as he thinks, lay too great a stress on differences.

So again, we conceive, he fails entirely in doing justice to the characters of those great men who stood forward—few in number, but devoted in zeal, and deeply rooted in conviction—to deliver the Church in the twelfth century from the secularity and utter corruption into which it had fallen—to introduce a moral reformation, and to secure that reformation according to the best of their judgment, by giving the Church the power of self-government.

Can any one who has contemplated the deep abyss of degra-

dation into which the papacy had fallen in the tenth and eleventh centuries—when the salt had lost its savour, as it might seem, irrecoverably,—when, according to the language of the time, it was felt and deplored that Christ was asleep in the ship —and when the Church was just being sunk into and identified with the world, a world of vice, violence, and iniquity—not admire the band of resolute reformers who raised it from its low estate, and presented it, conspicuous in the piety and earnestness of its saints, and the devotion which pervaded the whole Christian body? Is there not a great work here, at which we might well turn aside, and see what has been done?

We select this instance, because it is a very marked one in the history of Latin Christianity. It is, perhaps, *the* very turning-point of its existence, and it is one which it seems to us the author of these volumes has very inadequately depicted.

It will, however, be more in place to speak on this point after we have given some sketch of the History itself.

Before doing that, we may refer to some minor arrangements, which assist materially in reading the History.

The tables of contents of each volume supply the dates of the events. These become a kind of chronological analysis of the work. Then, at the commencement of each of the historical periods into which the work is divided, there is a table of contemporary chronology, where we have the lists and dates of the popes, the contemporary patriarchs, emperors, and kings. These tables compensate, in some measure, for the want of fulness in the details of the narrative. The margin, again, supplies the dates. In some respects, there has been negligence in the printing. In vol. ii. p. 250, and those which follow, we have in each page the dates 778, 778, 769, 779, 779. These ought to have been respectively 768, 769, throughout.

There is also an inaccuracy often repeated, and of much more grave importance: the misplacing of the little letters that are intended to show the references to the notes. When a reader sees one of these, and looks down to the note, he naturally supposes that the reference there given is the authority for the statement in the text to which the letter is attached; but this is very often wrongly placed, and the reader is accordingly misled to suppose that an authority is given for a statement when it is not.

We have seen numerous instances of this. We shall specify one, because we wish to notice the passage on other grounds.

The election of Pope Damasus was disputed. As far as we can see, he was elected, but had not been consecrated, when a small minority of the clergy met and elected Ursinus or Ursicinus, and contrived to have him consecrated. Damasus and his party proceeded by violence to eject them from a church

which they were occupying. The tumult led to bloodshed, and very many of the party of Ursinus were killed. Ammianus Marcellinus states this generally. It is recorded by Jerome, Ruffinus, Socrates. But there is also an account of it in a memorial addressed to the Emperors some time after; to which is prefixed a preface, giving an account of the affair which is most unfavourable to Damasus; accusing him of various misdemeanours, and of having himself taken the most prominent part in the affray; and this with a vehemence of expression, which gives the whole the character of a violent personal attack. This Sirmond discovered in MS. and printed. Its whole tone is such that one would not be disposed to give it any weight, even if there were no other account of the proceedings, nor other reason to suspect it of unfaithfulness. There is such reason, however, in the high esteem in which Damasus was held; in the fact that he belonged to the strict religious party of the time; that he was the friend of Jerome; that it was he who urged and encouraged the new translation of the Scriptures; that he was something of a sacred poet; that Jerome deferred to him on points of authority, while he asked Jerome for explanations of Holy Scripture; that he was regarded as the pattern of orthodoxy, and that agreement with the faith of Damasus was the standard of right belief laid down by Theodosius. Especially he encouraged religious retirement, and abundant charities and holy life, among the Christians of Rome. That such a person should be the object of attack, that his character should be calumniated, and malignant reports circulated about him, would not be strange, even if there were no party reasons for it; and we should have thought that an historian, writing of that period, who had thought fit to mention these reports (which, of course, it may be necessary to do in order to give us a true view of the state of the Roman Church, of the evil as well as the good that was in it), ought to have put forward the slight grounds on which they are based, and their improbability, so clearly as not to leave any other impression on the reader's mind. We think Dean Milman has not done this. He has stated the calumnies against Damasus and also those against Jerome, without mentioning that Jerome distinctly denied the charges; as who that at all appreciates his character could doubt that they were calumnies?

We will give the description from the History of Latin Christianity:—

'On the death of Liberius, the factions, which had smouldered in secret, broke out again with fatal fury. The Pontificate of Damasus displays Christianity now not merely the dominant, it might almost seem the sole religion of Rome; and the Roman character is working as visibly into Christianity. The election to the Christian bishopric arrays the people in adverse factions; the government is appalled; churches become citadels,

are obstinately defended, furiously stormed; they are defiled with blood. Men fall in murderous warfare before the altar of the Prince of Peace. In one sense it might seem the reanimation of Rome to new life, ancient Rome is resuming her wonted but long-lost liberties. The iron hand of despotism, from the time of the last Triumvirate, or rather from the accession of Augustus to the Empire, had compressed the unruly populace, which only occasionally dared to break out, on a change in the Imperial dynasty, to oppose, or be the victims of, the Prætorian soldiery. Now, however, the Roman populace appears quickened by a new principle of freedom; of freedom, if with some of its bold independence, with all its blind partisanship, its headstrong and stubborn ferocity. The great offices, which still perpetuated in name the ancient Republic, the Senatorship, Quæstorship, Consulate, are quietly transmitted according to the Imperial mandates, excite no popular commotion, nor even interest; for they are honorary titles, which confer neither influence, authority, nor wealth. Even the Prefecture of the city is accepted at the will of the Emperor, who rarely condescends to visit Rome. But the election to the bishopric is now not merely an affair of importance—*the* affair of paramount importance it might seem,—in Rome; it is an event in the annals of the world. The heathen historian, on whose notice had already been forced the Athanasian controversy, Athanasius himself, the acts and the exile of Liberius, assigns the same place to the contested promotion of Damasus which Livy might to that of one of the great consuls, tribunes, or dictators. He interprets, as well as relates, the event:—"No wonder that for so magnificent a prize as the Bishopric of Rome, men should contest with the utmost eagerness and obstinacy. To be enriched by the lavish donations of the principal females of the city; to ride, splendidly attired, in a stately chariot; to sit at a profuse, luxuriant, more than imperial, table—these are the rewards of successful ambition." The honest historian contrasts this pomp and luxury with the abstemiousness, the humility, the exemplary gentleness of the provincial prelates. Ammianus, ignorant or regardless as to the legitimacy of either election, arraigns both Damasus and his rival Ursicinus as equally guilty authors of the tumult. Of the Christian writers (and there are, singularly enough, contemporary witnesses, probably eye-witnesses, on each side), the one asserts the priority and legality of election in favour of Damasus, the other of Ursicinus; the one aggravates, the other extenuates the violence and slaughter. But that scenes occurred of frightful atrocity is beyond all doubt. So long and obstinate was the conflict, that Juventius, the Præfect of the city, finding his authority contemned, his forces unequal to keep the peace, retired into the neighbourhood of Rome. Churches were garrisoned, churches besieged, churches stormed and deluged with blood. In one day, relates Ammianus, above one hundred and thirty dead bodies were counted in the basilica of Sisinnius. The triumph of Damasus cannot relieve his memory from the sanction, the excitement, hardly from active participation in these deeds of blood. Nor did the contention cease with the first discomfiture and banishment of Ursicinus: he was more than once recalled, exiled, again set up as rival bishop, and re-exiled. Another frightful massacre took place in the church of St. Agnes. The Emperor was forced to have recourse to the character and firmness of the famous heathen Prætextatus, as successor to Juventius in the government of Rome, in order to put down with impartial severity these disastrous tumults. Some years elapsed before Damasus was in undisputed possession of his see.

'The strife between Damasus and Ursicinus was a prolongation or revival of that between Liberius and Felix, and so may have remotely grown out of the doctrinal conflict of Arianism and Trinitarianism.'—Vol. i. pp. 67—70.

We need cite no more; we will only observe here that Dr. Milman seems to be right in supposing that there was a contest between Arianism and Catholicity; but as he says before, at p. 65, that 'Bishop Felix, if not himself an Arian, did not scruple to communicate with Arians,' we might be led to think, as the Preface to the 'libel' asserts, that the party of Felix had elected Damasus; whereas it is certain, from a passage in a letter of S. Jerome to Damasus, which the author has overlooked, that Ursinus was the Arian, Damasus the Catholic Bishop. His words are:—'Et si ita est, cur ab Ario parietibus separamur; perfidia copulati? Jungatur cum Beatitudine tuâ Ursinus; cum Ambrosio Auxentius.' (Epist. xv. vol. i. p. 39. Ed. Vallars.) As Auxentius was the Arian anti-Bishop of Milan, so it would seem that Ursinus was the Arian anti-Pope of Rome. But, as the Dean says, in a note, p. 68, 'According to the Preface (is 'it quite certain that the Preface is of the same date?) to this 'Libellus Precum, Damasus is supported by the party of Felix; 'he was the successor of Felix, the reputed Arian, Ursicinus of 'Liberius.' We think that the Preface is not of the same date as the Libellus—that it is written by a violent partisan, opposed to Damasus, and also opposed to the Arians; possibly by one of the Luciferians—that party in the Church who refused to join in the healing measures of Athanasius, or to communicate with those who received with returning Arianizers. Anyhow, it bears the marks of being a calumnious production.

But the passage we are more concerned with occurs a little later. The Dean has been speaking of monasticism in Rome. Now, when asceticism is the supposed fruit of the spirit of the age—when it is the seemingly natural development of the religious temper—it is viewed by him with condescending acquiescence. But here we have asceticism springing up in the midst of that most luxurious, wealthy, pleasure-loving city, Rome; springing up under the sanction and encouragement of a few, a very few, great and earnest-minded men—of the very practical Athanasius, a man in whom good sense is as conspicuous as sanctity; of Jerome, one of the most learned and able men of the time; of Damasus, the Bishop of the city, himself a man of refined taste, and one that, as we have seen, thought it right to adopt great external splendour and style. The Dean considers this asceticism a development of the Roman character; '... is Christian Stoicism. We would only observe that asce-m was so universal that it would be much more reason- to attribute it to some common principle in human nature in Christianity.

But the Roman character did not interwork into the general Chris-nity alone, it embraced monastic Christianity, in all its extremest rigour,

its sternest asceticism, with the same ardour and energy. Christian Stoicism could not but find its Catos; but it was principally among the females that the recoil seemed to take place from the utter shamelessness, the unspeakable profligacy of the Imperial times to a severity of chastity, to a fanatic appreciation of virginity, as an angelic state, as a kind of religious aristocratical distinction, far above the regular virtues of the wife or the matron. Pope Damasus, though by no means indifferent to the splendour of his office, was the patron, as his secretary Jerome was the preacher of this powerful party; and between this party and the priesthood of Rome there was already that hostility which has so constantly prevailed between the Regulars, the observants of monastic rule, and what were called in later times the secular clergy. The monastics inveighed against the worldly riches, pomp, and luxury of the clergy: the clergy looked with undisguised jealousy on the growing, irresistible influence of the monks, especially over the high-born females. Jerome hated, and was hated with the most cordial reciprocity. The austere Jerome was accused, unjustly no doubt, of more than spiritual intimacy with his distinguished converts; his enemies brought a charge of adultery against Pope Damasus himself.'—Vol. i. pp. 71, 72.

On these last words there is the following note, the note-mark being attached to the word 'himself.'

'Quem in tantum matronæ diligebant, ut matronarum auriscalpius diceretur.—So says the preface to the hostile petition, the Libellus Precum. Apud Sirmond. i. p. 136.'—Vol. i. p. 72.

Of course one would suppose that this charge was expressed in the words cited in the note, and was consequently a charge of habitual adultery, and was contained in the preface to the Hostile Petition. This is not an unimportant point. The writer of that preface evidently endeavoured to allege all he could against the character of Damasus. But he does not bring this charge. He does not insinuate it. He only accuses the Bishop —as any foul-mouthed slanderer now might accuse a holy man, who was the adviser and director of religious women—of ministering to the relief of their 'itching ears;' or, as we might say, tickling their ears. The word 'auriscalpius' has no impure sense. Anastasius, writing two centuries later, says that Damasus was accused of adultery, and cleared by a council of forty-four bishops. Just so S. Athanasius was accused of murder, and produced the man alleged to have been murdered, as a living testimony to the falsity of the charge. But coming to us only on the authority of Anastasius, the whole statement is very doubtful; and we think the author should have taken care not to allow any impression of the truth of these insinuations to remain.

To return; great assistance in mastering the History may be derived from the portions into which the author has divided it; each book corresponding to one of the divisions; and the divisions themselves being based on the marked points in the progress

and development of the Latin Church, and the power of its Bishops. The three volumes already published bring that power up to the verge of its greatest external height, at the close of the twelfth century. But through what a series of wonderful changes did it arrive at that point!

If there is one thing which strikes us more than any other in the History of Latin Christianity, it is the vitality of that system whose progress it depicts; a vitality from which it not only withstands persecution, from heathen or heretical emperors, —continues as a barrier against invading tribes, living on while they, heretical and infidel, as well as barbarian, sweep over and almost sweep away the Churches, first of one part, then another, of Christendom—is tossed about by powerful emperors whose interests clash with those of the Church, or who would reform the Church, and masters and survives them —but what is more wonderful, springs up again after years of indifference and weakness, retains its hold on the world notwithstanding its gross corruptions, and when it might seem that the papacy itself had sunk into a depth of degradation from which it could not recover, yet under Pontiffs of a different character is again and again restored. Imperial Rome gained its hold on the world by slow and gradual advances. It had its reverses, and in early days there were times when it was on the verge of extinction; when Porsena all but, or altogether, overcame it—or when the Capitol, alone left, was saved as by a divine intervention. Old Rome, too, had its internal contentions, and it might at last seem strange that it held so long together. But these are nothing to what Christian Rome exhibits. Earthly power goes on increasing, and once destroyed, it cannot be restored; but a power which rests on influence over the minds of men, a religious influence, survives under the seeming loss of all external power. It is strengthened under oppression. It flourishes amid calamities. It shoots forth again as soon as it is cut down; and, as in a night, recovers and extends its former empire. And there was this influence in the truths which Christianity taught, and of which Rome was the centre, even when, as existing in Rome itself, they were overlaid with corruptions.

I. Four centuries from the birth of Christ—little more than three and a half from its own origination—bring the Roman Church to a position of independence, of manifested dignity, of influence over the world as well as over the Christian body. It is interesting to see how it emerges from time to time from the security in which its earlier history is involved: how, ever and anon, as you go over the list of its Bishops and the years of their supposed episcopates, you come across points where the

obscurity is in a measure removed, and some individual stands out conspicuously, or some view is given of the condition of the Church itself. Myths and forgeries being removed, you see S. Clement, in his calm and brotherly office, exhorting the Corinthian Christians, Anicetus and Polycarp, Victor, and Zephyrinus and Callistus—later still, Cornelius and Dionysius. Then, when the empire became Christian, an association, which is mentioned in the first century only as an obscure, despised sect, comes to be recognised as an empire within an empire, meets emperors face to face, and receives homage, as a spiritual guide and ruler, from them.

The first division of the History begins at the earliest period of the existence of Christianity in Rome, when it was almost unknown in the world. Dr. Milman brings out fully the view which has the remarkably concurrent support of the Chevalier Bunsen and Cardinal Wiseman, that the Christians in Rome for more than two centuries were a Greek-speaking people. The view has been maintained with great ability, but we are disposed to think that it is somewhat exaggerated. The strongest argument for it, no doubt, is that which Dr. Wiseman has worked out, namely, that the first Latin versions of the Scriptures were made in Africa, as if they were not needed in Rome. This might seem, to a person of this day, a strong argument, but we doubt its being so. We doubt, that is, whether it implies that the great body of the Christians spoke Greek as their proper language. It is clear, from what Irenæus says of the many nations of barbarians who were Christians, and had not the Holy Scriptures in their language, that the need for translating them was not felt so strongly then as we might suppose. The mass of Christians did not read the Scriptures. The educated classes in Rome were able to read the Greek; whereas, in Africa, the same class could not do it. Greek was the literary language in Rome; from this cause, as well as the universal circulation of works written in that language, the Christian literature was Greek. The language of the religious services bears trace of a Greek original; but that Greek was the language in which it was ordinarily celebrated in the Roman churches of the second century is, we think, highly questionable.

From this obscurity the Roman Church gradually emerged, as its numbers increased and commanded the attention, the deference, the persecutions, or the submission, of the world and the rulers of the world—till, in the middle of the fourth century, after Silvester, Julius, and Liberius, Pope Damasus stands out to be praised and maligned, and the bloody contention of the Christians in the election of a bishop, and the splendour in which that bishop lives, are subjects for the historian

of the world to notice; as, indeed, the world was coming to cast in its lot with the rising religion, and, by submitting, to try to share its power. Paganism was being put down. And as the world was coming into, and lowering the discipline and the common standard of Christian practice, there was rising up, as a counterbalancing influence, as an attempt to realize that apostolic model of religion, which the Holy Scriptures set forth—that severance from the world and union in religious strictness and retirement which we call Monachism. Christianity has mastered Paganism, and develops within itself a strict and holy rule, so that there is a world and a select religious body within itself. Coincidently with the Emperors becoming Christians, the seats of empire were removed to Constantinople and to Milan. Rome was left to the undivided influence, and gradually to the undivided rule, of the Bishop of the Church that 'sojourned there.'

II. The next half century, or little more, witnesses a revolution. The old empire, with its centuries of accumulated power, has fallen; whilst hordes of savage tribes overthrow and tread upon it. They build not up an empire for themselves, but prepare the way for the development of a principle of life and power which exists within the ancient and outgrown body; they break down that power which hinders it from manifesting itself. As the embryo out of the decaying seed, as the young out of the broken egg, so did the power of the Latin Church spring from the destruction of the Western Empire,—its life was manifested in the moral death and corruption of the Roman people. The contrast of Rome and Constantinople, throughout their history, shows that the destruction of the imperial power was the great means of developing the spiritual. And the bishops of Rome, as it were in the way of an anticipatory omen, showed their power on the first coming of the barbarians against the city. They overawed, and swayed, and turned back the conquerors. They saved Rome. They became the chief persons in Rome itself. They claimed authority in, if not over, the whole Church.

These sixty years include the period of the great controversies respecting the Incarnation, which shook the Eastern Church, and tended greatly to elevate the influence and authority of the see of Rome. The tone in which these subjects are treated here may be called impartial. We consider that it labours under one great fault. It does not enter into the views, and so cannot rightly appreciate the conduct, of those who believed that truth ought to be contended for—the truth on a point which is essential to the Christian faith. S. Cyril is treated with uniform unmitigated severity, and, as it were, with detestation.

On the other hand, S. Leo is evidently a character on whom the author delights to dwell. In him he sees no fault. There is a nobleness and greatness in his character which captivates the imagination of the poet, and draws out all his sympathies. He is one born to command, and to bow the will of others to his own. Dean Milman's character of him will be read with interest:—

'The Pontificate of Leo the Great is one of the epochs in the history of Latin, or rather of universal Christianity. Christendom, wherever mindful of its divine origin, and of its proper humanising and hallowing influence, might turn away in shame from these melancholy and disgraceful contests in the East. On the throne of Rome alone, of all the greater sees, did religion maintain its majesty, its sanctity, its piety; and, if it demanded undue deference, the world would not be inclined rigidly to question pretensions supported as well by such conscious power as by such singular and unimpeachable virtue; and by such inestimable benefits conferred on Rome, on the Empire, on civilization. Once Leo was supposed to have saved Rome from the most terrible of barbarian conquerors; a second time he mitigated the horrors of her fall, before the King of the Vandals. During his pontificate, Leo is the only great name in the Empire; it might almost seem in the Christian world. The Imperial Sovereignty might be said to have expired with Theodosius the Great. Women ruled in Ravenna and in Constantinople, and their more masculine abilities, even their virtues, reflected a deeper shame on the names of Theodosius II. and Valentinian III., the boy sovereigns of the East and West. Even after the death of Theodosius, Marcian reigned in the East, as the husband of Pulcheria. In the West the suspected fidelity impaired the power, as it lowered the character, of Aëtius; his inhuman murder deprived the empire of its last support; and the Count Boniface, the friend of Augustine, in his fatal revenge, opened Africa to the desolating Vandal. Leo stood equally alone and superior in the Christian world. Two years before the accession of Leo, Augustine had died. He had not lived to witness the capture and ruin of Hippo, his episcopal city. The fifth year after the accession of Leo, died Cyril of Alexandria; Nestorius survived, but in exile, his relentless rival. He was succeeded by Dioscorus, who seemed to have inherited all which was odious in Cyril, with far inferior polemic ability; afterwards an Eutychian heretic, and hardly to be acquitted of the murder of his rival, Flavianus. This future victim of the enmity of Dioscorus filled the see of Constantinople. Domnus, a name of no great distinction, was Patriarch of Antioch. In the West there are few, either ecclesiastics or others, who even aspire to a doubtful fame; such as Prosper, the poet of the Pelagian controversy, and Cassianus, the legislator of the Western monasteries.

'Leo, like most of his great predecessors and successors, was a Roman. He was early devoted to the service of the Church; and so high was the opinion of his abilities, that even as an acolyte he was sent to Africa with letters condemnatory of Pelagianism. By the great African prelates Aurelius and St. Augustine he was confirmed in his strong aversion to those doctrines, which might seem irreconcilable with his ardent piety. He urged upon Pope Sixtus the persecution of the unfortunate Julianus. When Leo was yet only a deacon, Cassianus dedicated to him his work on the Incarnation. At the decease of Pope Sixtus, Leo was absent on a civil mission, the importance of which shows the lofty estimate of his powers. It was no less than an attempt to reconcile the two rival generals, Aëtius and Albinus, whose fatal quarrel hazarded the dominion of Rome in Gaul.

There was no delay; all Rome, clergy, senate, people, by acclamation, raised the absent Leo to the vacant see. Leo disdained the customary hypocrisy of compelling the electors to force the dignity upon him. With the self-confidence of a commanding mind he assumed the office, in the pious assurance that God would give him strength to fulfil the arduous duties so imposed. Leo was a Roman in sentiment as in birth. All that survived of Rome, of her unbounded ambition, her inflexible perseverance, her dignity in defeat, her haughtiness of language, her belief in her own eternity, and her indefeasible title to universal dominion, her respect for traditionary and written law, and of unchangeable custom, might seem concentred in him alone. The union of the Churchman and the Roman is singularly displayed in his sermon on the day of St. Peter and St. Paul; their conjoint authority was that double title to obedience on which he built his claim to power, but chiefly as successor of St. Peter, for whom and for his ecclesiastical heirs he asserted a proto-Apostolic dignity. From Peter and through Peter all the other Apostles derived their power. No less did he assert the predestined perpetuity of Rome, who had only obtained her temporal autocracy to prepare the way, and as a guarantee, for her greater spiritual supremacy. St. Peter and St. Paul were the Romulus and Remus of Christian Rome. Pagan Rome had been the head of the heathen world; the empire of her divine religion was to transcend that of her worldly dominion. Her victories had subdued the earth and the sea, but she was to rule still more widely than she had by her wars, through the peaceful triumphs of her faith. It was because Rome was the capital of the world that the chief of the Apostles was chosen to be her teacher, in order that from the head of the world the light of truth might be revealed over all the earth.

'The haughtiness of the Roman might seem to predominate over the meekness of the Christian. Leo is indignant that slaves were promoted to the dignity of the sacerdotal office; not merely did he require the consent of the master, lest the Church should become a refuge for contumacious slaves, and the established rights of property be invaded, but the baseness of the slave brought discredit on the majesty of the priestly office.

'Though Leo's magnificent vision of the universal dominion of Rome and of Christianity blended the indomitable ambition of the ancient Roman with the faith of the Christian, the world might seem rather darkening towards the ruin of both. Leo may be imagined as taking a calm and comprehensive survey of the arduous work in which he was engaged, the state of the various provinces over which he actually exercised, or aspired to, supremacy. In Rome heathenism appears, as a religion, extinct; but heretics, especially the most odious of all, the Manicheans, were in great numbers. In Rome, Leo ruled not merely with Apostolic authority, but took upon himself the whole Apostolic function. He was the first of the Roman Pontiffs whose popular sermons have come down to posterity. The Bishops of Constantinople seem to have been the great preachers of their city. Pulpit oratory was their recommendation to the see, and the great instrument of their power. Chrysostom was not the first, though the greatest, who had been summoned to that high dignity, for the fame of his eloquence. From the pulpit Nestorius had waged war against his adversaries. Leo, no doubt, felt his strength; he could cope with the minds of the people, and make the pulpit what the rostrum had been of old. His sermons singularly contrast with the florid, desultory, and often imaginative and impassioned style of the Greek preachers. They are brief, simple, severe; without fancy, without metaphysic subtlety, without passion: it is the Roman Censor animadverting with nervous majesty on the vices of the people; the Roman Prætor dictating the law,

and delivering with authority the doctrine of the faith. They are singularly Christian—Christian as dwelling almost exclusively on Christ, his birth, his passion, his resurrection; only polemic so far as called upon by the prevailing controversies to assert with especial emphasis the perfect deity and the perfect manhood of Christ. Either the practical mind of Leo disdained, or in Rome the age had not yet fully expanded the legendary and poetic religion, the worship of the Virgin and the Saints. St. Peter is not so much a sacred object of worship as the great ancestor from whom the Roman Pontiff has inherited supreme power. One martyr alone is commemorated, and that with nothing mythic or miraculous in the narrative—the Roman Laurentius, by whose death Rome is glorified, as Jerusalem by that of Stephen.'—Vol. i. pp. 178—182.

Again, after describing the condition of the Eastern Church during this period of controversy, and its subjection to the imperial authority, he says:—

'Leo seemed fully to comprehend the importance and the dignity of his position. He took the most zealous interest in the whole controversy, but his activity was grave, earnest, and serious. His language to the Eastern Emperors, and especially to the Princess Pulcheria, may sound too adulatory to modern ears. The divinity of the earthly sovereign was acknowledged in terms too nearly approaching that reserved for the great divine Sovereign. This, however, must be judged with some regard to the sentiments and expressions of the age; and his deference was in language rather than in thought. Leo addresses these earthly masters with an independence of opinion, more as their equal, almost more as their master, than would have been ventured by any other subject at that time in either empire.

'In the West, meantime, Leo might seem, under the sole impulse of generous self-devotion, and reliance on the majesty of religion, to assume the noblest function of the civil power, the preservation of the Empire, of Italy, of Rome itself, of Christianity, from the most tremendous enemy which had ever threatened their freedom and peace. While the Emperor Valentinian III. took refuge in Rome, and rumours spread abroad of his meditated flight, abdication, abandonment of his throne, Leo almost alone stood fearless. An embassy, of which the Bishop of Rome was no doubt considered by the general reverence of his own age, as well as by posterity, as the head and chief, arrested the terrible Attila on the frontiers of Italy, and dispersed the host of savage and but half-human Huns. Leo, to grateful Rome, might appear as the peaceful Camillus, as the unarmed Marius, repelling invaders far more fearful than the Gauls or the Cimbrians.' . . . .

'The last struggles of Roman pride, which had rejected the demand of Attila for the hand of the Princess Honoria (his self-offered bride, whose strange adventures illustrate the degradation of the Imperial family), and which had been delayed by the obstinate resistance of Aquileia to the whole army of Attila, were crushed by the fall and utter extermination of that city, and the total subjugation of Italy as far as the banks of the Po. Valentinian, the Emperor, fled from Ravenna to Rome. To some no doubt he might appear to seek succour at the feet of the Roman Pontiff; but the abandonment of Italy was rumoured to be his last desperate determination.

'At this fearful crisis, the insatiable and victorious Hun seemed suddenly and unaccountably to pause in his career of triumph. He stood rebuked and subdued before a peaceful embassy, of which, with the greater part of the world, the Bishop of Rome, as he held the most conspicuous station, so he received almost all the honour. The names of the rich Consular Avienus, of the Prefect of Italy, Trigetius, who ventured with

Leo to confront the barbarian conqueror, were speedily forgotten; and Leo stands forth the sole preserver of Italy. On the shores of the Benacus the ambassadors encountered the fearful Attila. Overawed (as the belief was eagerly propagated, and as eagerly accepted) by the personal dignity, the venerable character, and by the religious majesty of Leo, Attila consented to receive the large dowry of the Princess Honoria, and to retire from Italy. The death of Attila in the following year, by the bursting of a blood-vessel, on the night during which he had wedded a new wife, may have been brooding, as it were, in his constitution, and somewhat subdued his fiercer energy of ambition. His army, in all probability, was weakened by its conquests, and by the uncongenial climate and unaccustomed luxuries of Italy. But religious awe may still have been the dominant feeling which enthralled the mind of Attila. The Hun, with the usual superstitiousness of the polytheist, may have trembled before the God of the stranger, whom nevertheless he did not worship. The best historian of the period relates that the fate of Alaric, who had survived so short a time the conquest of Rome, was known to Attila, and seemed to have made a profound impression upon him. The dauntless confidence and the venerable aspect of Leo would confirm this apprehension of encountering, as it were, in his sanctuary the God now adored by the Romans. Legend, indeed, has attributed the submission of Attila to a visible apparition of the Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, who menaced the trembling heathen with a speedy divine judgment if he repelled the proposals of their successor. But this materialising view, though it may have heightened the beauty of Raffaelle's painting of Leo's meeting with Attila, by the introduction of preter-human forms, lowers the moral grandeur of the whole transaction. The simple faith in his God, which gave the Roman Pontiff courage to confront, and threw that commanding majesty over his words and actions which wrought upon the mind of the barbarian, is far more Christianly sublime than this unnecessarily-imagined miracle.'—Vol. i. pp. 213—216.

III. The next period carries us on from this great Pope to the time of his greater successor, Gregory I. Through a period of a century and a half, popes of very ordinary qualities occupied the see. Gelasius and Hormisdas are most prominent. During most of this time Italy was occupied by Arian Ostrogoths, till these were overcome by the great general of Justinian. The Monophysite controversies raged in the East; and the influence of the Church was weakened by it. But the monotony of the papal history is relieved by some most interesting episodes: the conversion of the Teutonic races—the legislation of Justinian—the monasticism of the West.

In treating the first of these subjects, the author draws out the national character, temper, and religion of the Teutonic races; and shows how these predisposed them for receiving Christianity in the form in which it was now presented to them, and qualified it when received. He says:—

> There might appear in the Teutonic religious character a depth, ousness, and tendency to the mysterious, congenial to Christianity, ch would prepare them to receive the Gospel. The Grecian polytheist as often driven into Christianity by the utter void in his religion, and by

the incongruity of its poetic anthropomorphism with the progress of his discursive reason, as well as by his weariness with his unsatisfactory and exhausted philosophy: the Roman was commended by its high moral tone and vigour of character. But each had to abandon temples, rites, diversions, literature, which had the strongest hold on his habits and character, and so utterly incongruous with the primitive Gospel, that until Christianity made some steps towards the old religion by the splendour of its ceremonial, and the incipient paganising, not of its creed, but of its popular belief, there were powerful countervailing tendencies to keep him back from the new faith. And when the Greek entered into the Church, he was not content without exercising the quickness of his intelligence, and the versatilities of his language on his creed, without analysing, discussing, defining everything; or by intruding that higher part of his philosophy, which best assimilated with Christianity, he either philosophised Christianity, or for a time, as under the Neo-Platonists and Julian, set up a partially Christianised philosophy as a new and rival religion. The inveterate corruption of Roman manners confined that vigorous Christian morality, its strongest commendation to the Roman mind, at first within the chosen few, who were not utterly abased by licentiousness or by servility: and even with them in large part it was obedience to civil authority, respect for established law, perhaps in many a kind of sympathy with the lofty and independent sacerdotal dignity, the sole representative of old Roman freedom, which contributed to Christianise the Latin world.

'How much more suited were some parts of the Teutonic character to harmonise at first with Christianity, and to keep the proselytes in submission to the authority of its instructors in these sublime truths; at the same time to strengthen the Church by the infusion of its own strength and independence of thought and action, as well as to barbarise it with that ferocity which causes, is increased by, and maintains, the foreign conquest of ruder over more polished races! Already the German had the conception of an illimitable Deity, towards whom he looked with solemn and reverential awe. Tacitus might seem to speak the language of a Christian father, almost of a Jewish prophet. Their gods could not be confined within walls, and it was degradation to these vast unseen powers to represent them under the human form. Reverential awe alone could contemplate that mysterious being which they called divinity. These deities, or this one Supreme, were shrouded in the untrodden, impenetrable forest. Such seems to have been the sublime conception above, if not anterior to, what may be called the mythology of Teutonic religion.'—Vol. i. pp. 257, 258.

We have not space to follow up this part of the subject, which is very interesting.

The legislation of Justinian might at first sight appear not very much in place; but it is made so by tracing out the extent to which it was modified by Christianity. This it was in but a slight degree; legislation respecting religion was added to the previous body of law; Christianity was taken into the system. It was not, as in our own Anglo-Saxon law, the fountain from which it sprung. The old long-established system continued; Christianity had come in upon a settled civilization. Among the northern tribes, civilization grew out of Christianity.

The age of Gregory the Great was the age of Benedict, the great moulder of Western Monasticism.

'The extension and organization of monasticism in the West owes its principal strength and uniformity to Benedict of Nursia. The life of Benedict, from infancy to death, is the most perfect illustration of the motives which then worked upon the mind of man. In him meet together and combine all those influences which almost divided mankind into recluses or cœnobites, and those who pursued an active life; as well as all the effects, in his case the best effects, produced by this phasis of human thought and feeling. Benedict, it was said, was born at that time, like a sun to dispel the Cimmerian darkness which brooded over Christendom, and to revive the expiring spirit of monasticism. The whole world was desolated by the inroads of the northern conquerors; the thrones of the new western kingdoms were filled by barbarian heretics; the East was distracted with controversy. War had not respected the monastic institutions; and those were fortunate who were shrouded in the mountain glens of the Apennines, or lay hid in some remote and sea-girt island. His age acknowledged Benedict as the perfect type of the highest religion, and Benedict impersonated his age.

'In the time of Benedict no man could have made a profound impression or exercised an enduring influence upon the mind of man, without that enthusiasm in himself which would environ him with wonder, or without exciting that enthusiasm in others which would eagerly accept, propagate, and multiply the miracles which avouched his sanctity.

'How perfectly the whole atmosphere was impregnated with this inexhaustible yearning for the supernatural, appears from the ardour with which the monastic passions were indulged at the earliest age. Children were nursed and trained to expect at every instant more than human interferences; their young energies had ever before them examples of asceticism, to which it was the glory, the true felicity of life, to aspire. The thoughtful child had all his mind thus pre-occupied; he was early, it might almost seem intuitively, trained to this course of life; wherever there was gentleness, modesty, the timidity of young passion, repugnance to vice, an imaginative temperament, a consciousness of unfitness to wrestle with the rough realities of life, the way lay invitingly open—the difficult, it is true, and painful, but direct and unerring way, to heaven. It lay through perils, but was made attractive by perpetual wonders; it was awful, but in its awfulness lay its power over the young mind. It learned to trample down that last bond which united the child to common humanity, filial reverence; the fond and mysterious attachment of the child and the mother, the inborn reverence of the son to the father. It is the highest praise of St. Fulgentius that he overcame his mother's tenderness by religious cruelty.

'History, to be true, must condescend to speak the language of legend; the belief of the times is part of the record of the times; and, though there may occur what may baffle its more calm and searching philosophy, it must not disdain that which was the primal, almost universal, motive of human life.

'Benedict was born at Nursia, in the province of Spoleto, of respectable parents. He was sent to Rome, according to still-prevailing custom, to be instructed in the liberal arts. But his pure spirit shrunk instinctively from the vices of the capital. He gave up the perilous study of letters, and preferred an holy ignorance. He fled secretly from the society of his dangerous associates, from the house of his parents, who, it seems, had accompanied him, as of old the father of Horace his son, to Rome. His faithful nurse alone discovered his design and accompanied his flight. This incident seems to imply that his flight took place at a very tender age; a circumstance, told at a later period, intimates that it was not before the first

impulses of youthful passion. He took refuge in a small village called Effide, about two miles from Subiaco. The rustic inhabitants, pleased with his modesty and sweetness of disposition, allowed him to inhabit a cell near their church. Here took place his first miracle. The faithful nurse, Cyrilla, had borrowed a stone sieve, commonly used in that part of the country to make bread. It fell from her hands, and broke in two. Benedict, moved by her distress, united the two pieces, prayed over them, and the vessel became whole. The wondering rustics are said to have hung the miraculously restored sieve over their church door. But the sensitive youth shrunk from fame, as he had from vice: he sought a deeper solitude. In the neighbourhood of Subiaco, by the advice and assistance of a monk, named Romanus, he found a wild and inaccessible cavern, into which he crept, and for three years the softly and delicately educated boy lay hid in this cold and dismal dwelling from the sight of men. His scanty food was supplied by Romanus, who took it by stealth from his own small pittance in his monastery. The cave was at the foot of the hill on which the monastery stood, but there was no path down the precipitous rock. The food, therefore, was let down by a rope, and a small bell tied to the rope gave notice of its coming. Once the devil broke the rope; but he could not baffle the inventive charity of Romanus. To an imagination so prepared, what scene could be more suited to nurture the disposition to wonders and visions than the wild and romantic region about Subiaco? The cave of Benedict is still shown as a hallowed place, high on the crest of a toppling rock, with the Anio roaring beneath in a deep ravine, clothed with the densest forest, and looking on another wild, precipitous crag. Half way up the zigzag and laborious path stands the convent of Benedict's sister, St. Scolastica. So entirely was Benedict cut off from the world that he ceased to mark not merely the progress of ordinary time, but even the fasts and festivals of the Church. A certain priest had prepared for himself some food of unusual delicacy for the festival of Easter. A mysterious admonition within his heart reproved him for this luxurious indulgence, while the servant of God was pining with hunger. Who he was, this holy and heaven-designated servant, or where he dwelt, the priest knew not, but he was led through the tangled thickets and over the rugged rocks to the cave of Benedict. Benedict was ignorant that it was Easter, and not till he was assured that it was that festal day, would he share in the heaven-sent banquet.

'The secret of his hiding-place was thus betrayed, and some of the rude shepherds of the country, seeing the hermit in his coarse attire, which was no more than a sheep-skin thrown round him, mistook him at first for a wild beast: but when they approached him, they were so melted by his gentle eloquence, that their hearts yielded at once, and they were subdued to courtesy of manners and Christian belief. . . .

'Three virtues constituted the sum of the Benedictine discipline. Silence with solitude and seclusion, humility, obedience, which, in the strong language of its laws, extended to impossibilities. All is thus concentrated on self. It was the man isolated from his kind who was to rise to a lonely perfection. All the social, all patriotic virtues were excluded: the mere mechanic observance of the rules of the brotherhood, or even the corporate spirit, are hardly worthy of notice, though they are the only substitutes for the rejected and proscribed pursuits of active life.

'The three occupations of life were the worship of God, reading, and manual labour. The adventitious advantages, and great they were, of these industrious agricultural settlements, were not contemplated by the founder; the object of the monks was not to make the wilderness blossom with fertility, to extend the arts and husbandry of civilised

life into barbarous regions, it was solely to employ in engrossing occupation that portion of time which could not be devoted to worship and to study.

'For the divine service the monks awoke at midnight; they retired again, and rose after a brief repose for matins. After matins they did not return to their beds, but spent the time in reading, meditation, or the singing of psalms. From prime to noon, and all after the brief meal, and another period of reading or meditation, was devoted to labour. At particular periods, as at harvest, the labouring brothers did not return home to their religious service; they knelt and performed it in the fields. The mass was not celebrated on ordinary days, only on Sundays and holidays.

'Abstinence from flesh, at least that of four-footed animals, was perpetual and universal; from that of fowls was prescribed with less rigour. The usual food was vegetable broth, bread, and a small measure of wine. From Easter to Pentecost there was no fast. From Pentecost to the ides of September, fasts on two days in the week; the rest of the year to Easter perpetual fast, with one evening meal of eggs or fish. Lent was still more rigorously enforced by abstinence not from food only, but from sleep and from speech. The punishment of delinquents was sequestration from the oratory, the table, and the common meetings; the contumacious and incorrigible were expelled from the community. The monastery contained within its walls the mill, the bakehouse, and everything necessary for life. It was strictly forbidden to partake of food without the walls; all wandering to any distance was prohibited; and if the monk was obliged to be absent during the whole day, he was enjoined to fast rather than partake of food abroad. . . .

'The vision of St. Benedict of the universal diffusion of his order was accomplished with a rapidity wonderful even in those times. In Italy, from Calabria to the Alps, Benedictine monasteries began to rise on the brows of beetling mountains, sometimes in quiet valleys. Their buildings gradually grew in spaciousness and splendour; nor did they absolutely abandon the cities, as dangerous to themselves or beyond the sphere of their exemplary rigour. Few, if any, of the great towns are without their Benedictine convent. Every monastery sent forth its colonies. The monks seem to multiply with greater fecundity than the population of the most flourishing cities, and were obliged to throw off their redundant brethren to some new settlement. They swarmed, according to their language, like bees. Wherever was the abode of men was the abode of these recluses, who had put off the ordinary habits, attire, occupations of men; wherever they settled in the troubled wilderness men gathered around them, as if to partake of their sanctity and security. Maurus, the faithful friend and associate of Benedict, had crossed the Alps even before his death. Bishop Innocent, of Le Mans, who had invited him to Gaul, had died before his arrival; but he was hospitably received in Orleans. The first Benedictine monastery in France rose at Glanfeuille, on the Loire, not far from Angers; it was but the first of many rich and noble foundations—foundations which, as they grew in wealth and splendour, and, in consequence, in luxury and ease, were either themselves brought back by some stern reformer, who wrought them up to their old austere discipline, or rivalled and supplanted by new monasteries, which equalled or surpassed the rigour of Benedict himself. The name of St. Maur is dear to letters. Should his disciples have in some degree departed from the iron rule of their founder, the world, even the enlightened Christian world, will pardon them if their profound and useful studies have withdrawn them from mechanical and automatic acts of devotion. In Spain the monasteries mostly fell in the general wreck of Christianity on the Mahommedan conquest; few scanty and

doubtful records survived, to be gleaned by the industry of their successors, as Christianity slowly won back the land.

'With St. Augustine the rule of St. Benedict passed to England; but there it might seem as if the realm, instead of banishing them, or permitting their self-banishment, to the wild heath or the mountain crest, had chosen for them, or allowed them to choose, the fairest spots in the land for their settlements. In every rich valley, by the side of every clear and deep stream, arose a Benedictine Abbey. The labours of the monks in planting, in cultivation, in laying out the sunny garden, or hanging the hill with trees, may have added much to the picturesque grace of these scenes; but, in general, if a district in England be surveyed, the most convenient, most fertile, most peaceful spot, will be found to have been the site of a Benedictine abbey.

'Their numbers at any one time it may be difficult to estimate. Abbeys rose and fell, like other human institutions; the more favoured, however, handed down the sacred tradition of their foundation, of their endowments, of their saints, of their miracles, of their good deeds to civilisation, till the final wreck of monastic institutions during the last century; and even from that wreck a few have survived, or lifted up again their venerable heads.'—Vol. i. pp. 414—426.

The following passage, at the opening of the pontificate of Gregory the Great, shows the manner in which Dr. Milman regards the Papal power as produced by, and adapted to, the wants of the age:—

'Now was the crisis in which the Papacy, the only power which lay not entirely and absolutely prostrate before the disasters of the times—which had an inherent strength, and might resume its majesty—the power which was most imperatively required to preserve that which was to survive out of the crumbling wreck of Roman civilisation, must re-awaken its obscured and suspended life. To Western Christianity was absolutely necessary a centre, standing alone, strong in traditionary reverence, and in acknowledged claims to supremacy. Even the perfect organisation of the Christian hierarchy might in all human probability have fallen to pieces in perpetual conflict: it might have degenerated into a half secular feudal caste, with hereditary benefices more and more entirely subservient to the civil power, a priesthood of each nation or each tribe, and gradually sinking to the intellectual or religious level of the nation or tribe. On the rise of a power both controlling and conservative, hung, humanly speaking, the life and death of Christianity—of Christianity as a permanent, aggressive, expansive, and, to a certain extent, uniform system. There must be a counterbalance to barbaric force, to the unavoidable anarchy of Teutonism, with its tribal, or at the utmost national independence, forming a host of small, conflicting, antagonistic kingdoms. All Europe had been what England was under the Octarchy, what Germany was when her emperors were weak; and even her emperors she owed to Rome, to the Church, to Christianity. Providence might have otherwise ordained it, but it is impossible for man to imagine by what other organising or consolidating force the commonwealth of the Western nations could have grown up to a discordant, indeed, and conflicting league, but still to a league, with that unity and conformity of manners, usages, laws, religion, which have made their rivalries, oppugnancies, and even their long ceaseless wars, on the whole to issue in the noblest, highest, most intellectual form of civilisation known to man. It is inconceivable that Teutonic Europe, or Europe so deeply interpenetrated with Teutonism, could have been condensed or compelled into a vast Asiatic despotism, or succession of despotisms. Immense and interminable

as have been the evils and miseries of the conflict between the southern and northern, the Teutonic and Roman, the hierarchical and civil elements of our social system, out of these conflicts has at length arisen the balance and harmony of the great states which constitute European Christendom, and are now peopling other continents with kindred and derivative institutions. It is impossible to conceive what had been the confusion, the lawlessness, the chaotic state of the middle ages, without the mediæval Papacy; and of the mediæval Papacy the real father is Gregory the Great. In all his predecessors there was much of the uncertainty and indefiniteness of a new dominion. Christianity had converted the Western world—it had by this time transmuted it: in all except the Roman law, it was one with it. Even Leo the Great had something of the Roman dictator. Gregory is the Roman altogether merged in the Christian bishop. It is a Christian dominion, of which he lays the foundations in the Eternal City, not the old Rome associating Christian influence to her ancient title of sovereignty.

'Gregory united in himself every qualification and endowment which could command the veneration and attachment of Rome and of his age. In his descent he blended civil and ecclesiastical nobility. He was of a senatorial family: his father bore the imperial name of Gordian, his mother that of Sylvia. A pope (Felix II.) was his ancestor in the fourth degree—the pope who had built the church of SS. Cosmos and Damianus, close to the temple of Romulus. Two sainted virgins, Thirsilla and Sylvia, were his aunts. To his noble descent was added considerable wealth; and all that wealth, directly he became master of it by the death of his father, was at once devoted to religious uses. He founded and endowed, perhaps from Sicilian estates, six monasteries in that island; a seventh, in Rome, he chose for his own retreat; and having lavished on the poor all his costly robes, his silk, his gold, his jewels, his furniture, he violently wrenched himself from the secular life (in which he had already attained to the dignity of prætor of the city), and not even assuming the abbacy of his convent, but beginning with the lowest monastic duties, he devoted himself altogether to God. His whole time was passed in prayer, reading, writing, and dictation. The fame of his unprecedented abstinence and boundless charity spread abroad, and, as usual, took the form of miracle. He had so destroyed his health by fasting, vigil, and study, that his brethren were obliged to feed him by compulsion. His life hung on a thread, and he feared that he should not have strength to observe the indispensable fast even on Good Friday. By the prayers of the holy Eleutherius his stomach was endowed with supernatural strength, and never after (he had manifestly, however, undermined his constitution) refused the sacred duty of abstinence. His charity was tried by an angel in the garb of a shipwrecked sailor, whose successive visits exhausted all he had, except a silver vessel set apart for the use of his mother. This, too, he gave, and the satisfied angel at length revealed himself. The monastery of St. Andrew was a perpetual scene of preternatural wonder. Fugitive monks were seized upon by devils, who confessed their power to Gregory; others were favoured with visits of angels summoning them to peace; and one brother, whose whole life, excepting the intervals of food and sleep, was spent in psalmody, was not merely crowned by invisible hands with white flowers, but fourteen years after, a fragrance, as of the concentrated sweetness of all flowers, breathed from his tomb. Such was the poetry of those days.'—Vol. i. pp. 429—432.

We have not space to extract more respecting the character of this great man. Great in every respect: as a doctor, a ruler, a saint, and to us especially interesting as the apostle of England, seeing that the conversion of our forefathers is owing no

less to the labours of Augustine, than to the zeal, wisdom, and firmness of S. Gregory himself. At this point the third portion of the History of Latin Christianity ends. The third step has been made, and the Bishop of Rome is become the father in Christ, and the spiritual ruler of the races who are destined to become the greatest people of the world. He is the spiritual father and ruler of Europe.

IV. But while the Gospel was subjecting these barbarian races to its sway, and preparing the way for the enlargement of the empire of Christ over the new nations that are springing into distinct life, a movement in the distant south, 'no bigger than a man's hand,' swells into a tempest which sweeps over the earliest and, as they once were, the fairest portions of the Christian Church. The history of Mohammed, the nature of the religion which bears his name, the narrative of its successes, form two very interesting and beautiful chapters of the next portion of our history, which extends from the time of Gregory I. to the crowning of Charlemagne, that is, over the space of two hundred years. The history of the Roman Church itself during that period is marked by comparatively few incidents of importance; but although the very existence of the Roman Church again and again seemed to be threatened, the changes which were going on among the nations of the world, the controversies of the Eastern Church, and the conversion of the northern tribes, contributed to establish it on a firmer basis. These two centuries witnessed the rise and progress and victories of Mohammedanism. It had no existence when they begun; when they ended it was established in Syria, Palestine, Africa, and Spain, and the tide was only turned back from France by the bravery of Charles Martel.

In this period, the author diversifies the narrative, which, if confined to the history of the Roman Church, would be very uninteresting, by some of the most pleasing episodical chapters of the work. Two, as we have said, are devoted to Mohammedanism; two to the Christianity of our own country, the account of the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons and the history of their religion, which was the fairest and brightest portion of the Christianity of these two centuries; then a chapter to the conversion of the Teutonic races beyond the Roman empire by the labours of S. Columban, S. Gall, and S. Boniface:

'It is difficult to conceive the motives which led forth these first pious wanderers from their native land. Columban, at his outset, was no missionary, urged by a passionate or determined zeal to convert Pagan nations to the Cross of Christ; nor was he a pilgrim, lured forth from his retreat by the unconquerable desire of visiting the scenes of apostolic labours, the spiritual wonders of Rome, or to do homage to the relics of Saints or Apostles. He and his followers seemed only to seek a safe retreat, in

which he might shroud his solitary devotion; or, if his ascetic fame should gather around him an increasing number of disciples, form a cœnobitic establishment. They might have found, it might be supposed, retirement not less secure against secular intrusion, as wild, as silent, as holy, in the yet peaceful Ireland, or in the Scottish islands, as in the mountains of the Vosges, or the valleys of the Alps.

'But the influence of Columban, as the parent of so many important monasteries on the borders and within the frontier of Teutonic Paganism, as well as the reverence with which his holy character was invested, and which enabled him to assert the moral dignity of Christianity with such intrepidity, are events which strongly mark the religious history of this age. The stranger monk issues from his retreat to rebuke the vices of kings, confronts the cruel Brunehaut; and such is the fearful sanctity which environs the man of God, that even her deadly hostility can venture nothing beyond his banishment.

'Columban was born in Leinster, at the period when Ireland is described as a kind of Hesperian elysium of peace and piety. His early aspirations after monastic holiness were fostered in the convent of Banchor, on the coast of Ulster. He became a proficient in the mystic piety of the day. But he was suddenly seized with the desire of foreign travel; he wrung an unwilling consent to his departure from his spiritual father, Comgal, abbot of Banchor. He just touched on, but shrunk from the contaminated shores of Paganised Britain, and landed in Gaul. The fame of his piety reached the ears of one of the kings of the land: all that Columban requested was permission to retire into some unapproachable wilderness.

'The woody mountains of the Vosges rose on the frontiers of the kingdoms of Austrasia and of Burgundy. Tribes of Pagan Suevians then occupied that part of Switzerland which bordered on those kingdoms. War and devastation had restored as solitudes to nature districts which had been reclaimed to culture and fertility by the industry of Roman colonists. It was on the site of ancient towns that hermits now found their wildernesses. Columban, with his twelve followers, first settled among the ruins of a small town called Anegratis. The woods yielded herbs and roots and the bark of trees for food, the streams water and probably fish. But the offerings of piety were not wanting; provisions were sent by those who were desirous of profiting by the prayers of these holy men. But the heart of Columban yearned for still more profound solitude. In the depths of the wild woods, about seven miles off, as he wandered with his book, he found a cave, of which the former inhabitant, a bear, gave up quiet possession to the saint—for the wild beasts, wolves as well as bears, and the Pagan Suevians, respected the man of God. Miracle as usual arose around the founder of a monastery. The fame of the piety and wonder-working powers of Columban gathered a still increasing number of votaries; the ruins of Anegratis could no longer contain the candidates for the monastic life.

'About eight miles distant lay the more extensive ruins of a fortified Roman town, Luxovium, now overgrown with the wild forest jungle, but formerly celebrated for its warm springs. Amid the remains of splendid baths and other stately buildings, Columban determined to establish a more regular monastery. The forest around is said to have been strewn with marble statues, and magnificent vestiges of the old Pagan worship. On this wreck of heathenism rose the monastery of Luxeuil. Neophytes crowded from all parts; the nobles of the court threw off their arms, or fled from the burthensome duties of civil life to this holy retreat. A second establishment became necessary, and in a beautiful spot, watered by several streams, rose the succursal abbey of Fontaines. Columban presided as abbot over all these institutions; his delight was ever to wander alone in

the woods, or to dwell for days in his lonely cave: but he still exercised strict superintendence over all the monasteries of the Rule which he had formed; he mingled in and encouraged their useful labours in husbandry, it was thought, with more than human wisdom and sagacity.

'But peace was not to be found even in the lonely forests of the Vosges. After twelve years of undisturbed repose, religious disputes invaded the quiet shades of Luxeuil. Columban was arraigned before a synod of Gaulish bishops for his heterodox usage about keeping Easter, in which he adhered to the old British discipline. Columban answered with a kind of pathetic dignity, "I am not the author of this difference. I came as a stranger to this land for the sake of our common Lord and Saviour Christ. I beseech you by that common Lord who shall judge us all, to allow me to live in silence, in peace, and in charity, as I have lived for twelve years, beside the bones of my seventeen departed brethren. Let Gaul receive into her bosom all those who, if they deserve it, will be received into the kingdom of heaven."

'Columban had to wage a nobler strife against the vices of the neighbouring court.'—Vol. ii. pp. 100—103.

After some further narrative which we must omit, we read:—

'Thus these Irish monks were not merely reinvigorating the decaying monastic spirit, which perhaps was languishing from the extreme severity of the rule of Cassianus, chiefly followed in the monasteries of Gaul, but they were winning back districts which had been won from Roman civilisation by advancing barbarism. Monasteries replace ruined Roman cities. From them issued almost a race of saints, the founders of some of the most important establishments within or on the borders of the old Roman territory: Magnus and Theodorus, the first abbots of Kempten and of Fussen; Attalus of Bobbio; St. Romaric of Remiremont; St. Omer, St. Bertin, St. Amand, the apostles of Flanders; St. Wandrille, the founder of Fontenelle, in Normandy. Gradually the great establishments, founded on the rule of Columban, dropped the few peculiarities of discipline which distinguished them from the Roman Church; they retained those of their rule, which differed from that which was now beginning to prevail throughout western Christendom. Yet there was nothing of great importance to distinguish them from the Benedictine foundations; their rule, habits, studies (all, perhaps, but their dress) were those of western monasticism.'—Vol. ii. p. 108.

From these more interesting stories we come to the history of the Papacy from Gregory I. to Gregory II.—the period of the Monothelite controversies, marked by the fall of Honorius and the cruelties inflicted on Martin. Italy during this period was subject to the Emperor of the East, and the position of the pontiffs was lowered even to the greatest humiliation. The Iconoclastic controversies followed, the narrative of which is vivid and of sustained interest. The following passage shows the tone of the writer with respect to the subject of the controversy:—

'The eighth century gave birth to a religious contest, in its origin, in its nature, and in its important political consequences entirely different from all those which had hitherto distracted Christendom. Iconoclasm was an attempt of the Eastern Emperor to change by his own arbitrary command the religion of his subjects. No religious revolution has ever been successful which has commenced with the government. Such revolu-

tions have ever begun] in the middle or lower orders of society, struck on some responsive chord of sympathy in the general feeling, supplied some religious want, stirred some religious energy, and shaken the inert strength of the established faith by some stronger counter emotion. Whatever the motives of the Emperor Leo the Isaurian (and on this subject, as in all the religious controversies where the writings of the unsuccessful party were carefully suppressed or perished through neglect, authentic history is almost silent), whether he was actuated by a rude aversion to what perhaps can hardly yet be called the fine arts with which Christianity was associating itself, or by a spiritual disdain and impatience of the degrading superstition into which the religion of the Gospel had so long been degenerating, the attempt was as politically unwise and unseasonable as the means employed were despotic and altogether unequal to the end. The time was past, if it had ever been, when an imperial edict could change, or even much affect, the actual prevailing religion of the empire. For this was no speculative article of belief, no question of high metaphysical theology, but a total change in the universal popular worship, in the spirit and in the essence, if not of the daily ritual, of countless observances and habitual practices of devotion. It swept away from almost all the churches of the Empire objects hallowed by devotion, and supposed to be endowed with miraculous agency; objects of hope and fear, of gratitude and immemorial veneration. It not merely invaded the public church, and left its naked walls without any of the old remembrances of faith and piety; it reached the private sanctuary of prayer. No one could escape the proscription; learned or unlearned, priest or peasant, monk or soldier, clergyman or layman, man, woman, and even child, were involved in the strife. Something to which their religious attachments clung, to which their religious passions were wedded, might at any time be forcibly rent away, insulted, trampled under foot; that which had been their pride and delight could only now be furtively visited, and under the fear of detection.

'Nor was it possible for this controversy to vent itself in polemic writings; to exhaust the mutual hatred which it engendered in fierce invectives, which, however they might provoke, were not necessarily followed by acts of conflict and bloodshed. Here actual, personal, furious collision of man and man, of faction and faction, of armed troops against armed troops, was inevitable. The contending parties did not assail each other with mutual anathemas, which they might despise, or excommunication and counter-excommunication, the validity of which might be questioned by either party. On one side it was a sacred obligation to destroy, to mutilate, to dash to pieces, to deface the objects on which the other had so long gazed with intense devotion, and which he might think it an equally sacred obligation to defend at the sacrifice of life. It was not a controversy, it was a feud; not a polemic strife, but actual war declared by one part of Christendom against the other. It was well perhaps for Christendom that the parties were not more equally balanced; that, right or wrong, one party in that division of the Christian world, where total change would have been almost extermination, obtained a slow but complete triumph.

'In all the controversies, moreover, in which the Emperors had been involved, whether they had plunged into them of their own accord, or had been compelled to take a reluctant part;—whether they embraced the orthodox or the erroneous opinions,—they had found a large faction, both of the clergy and the people, already enlisted in the cause. In this case ' had to create their own faction; and though so many of the clergy, conviction, fear, or interest, became Iconoclasts, as to form a council ctable for its numbers; though, among some part of the people, an

Iconoclastic fanaticism broke out, yet it was no spontaneous movement on their part. The impulse, to all appearance, emanated directly from the emperor. It was not called forth by any general expression of aversion to the existing superstition by any body of the clergy, or by any single bold reformer: it was announced, it was enacted in that character of Supreme Head of the Empire, which was still supposed to be vested in the Cæsar, and had descended to him as part of his inheritance from his pagan predecessors. This sovereignty comprehended religious as well as temporal autocracy; and of this the clergy, though they had often resisted it, and virtually, perhaps, held it to be abrogated, had never formally, publicly, or deliberately, declined the jurisdiction. It is a proof of the strong will and commanding abilities of the great Iconoclastic Emperors, that they could effect, and so long maintain, such a revolution, by their sole authority, throughout at least their eastern dominions.

'And there was this irremediable weakness in the cause of Iconoclasm. It was a mere negative doctrine, a proscription of those sentiments which had full possession of the popular mind, without any strong countervailing religious excitement. There was none of that appeal to principles like those of the Reformation, to the Bible, to justification by faith, to the individual sense of responsibility. The senses were robbed of their habitual and cherished objects of devotion, but there was no awakening of an inner life of intense and passionate piety. The cold naked walls from whence the Scriptural histories had been effaced, the despoiled shrines, the mutilated images, could not compel the mind to a more pure and immaterial conception of God and the Saviour. It was a premature Rationalism, enforced upon an unreasoning age—an attempt to spiritualise by law and edict a generation which had been unspiritualised by centuries of materialistic devotion. Hatred of images, in the process of the strife, might become, as it did, a fanaticism—it could never become a religion. Iconoclasm might proscribe idolatry, but it had no power of kindling a purer faith.

'The consequences of this new religious dissension were of the utmost political importance, both in the East and in the West. In the East, instead of consolidating the strength of Christendom in one great confederacy against invading Mohammedanism, it distracted the thoughts of men from their more pressing dangers, weakened the military energy which, under the Isaurian race of emperors, seemed likely to revive, depopularised with at least one half of their subjects, sovereigns of such great ability as Leo and Constantine Copronymus (whose high qualities for empire pierce through the clouds which are spread over their names by hostile annalists); and finally by adding a new element of animosity to the domestic intrigues within the palace, interrupted the regular succession, and darkened the annals of the empire with new crimes.

'But its more important results were the total disruption of the bond between the East and the West—the severance of the Italian province from the Byzantine Empire; the great accession of power to the Papacy, which took the lead in this revolution; the introduction of the Frankish kings into the politics of Italy; and eventually the establishment of the Western Empire under Charlemagne.

'Yet this question, thus prematurely agitated by the Iconoclastic emperors, and at this period of Christianity so fatally mistimed, is one of the most grave, and, it should seem, inevitable controversies, arising out of our religion. It must be judged by a more calm and profound philosophy than could be possible in times of actual strife between two impassioned and adverse factions. It is a conflict of two great principles, which it is difficult to reconcile. On the one hand, there can be no doubt that with

ignorant and superstitious minds, the use, the reverence, the worship of images, whether in pictures or statues, invariably degenerates into idolatry. The Church may draw fine and aerial distinctions between images as objects of reverence and objects of adoration; as incentives to the worship of more remote and immaterial beings, or as actual indwelling deities; it may nicely define the feeling which images ought to awaken;—but the intense and indiscriminating piety of the vulgar either understands not, or utterly disregards these subtleties: it may refuse to sanction, it cannot be said not to encourage, that devotion which cannot and will not weigh and measure either its emotions or its language. Image worship in the mass of the people, of the whole monkhood at this time, was undeniably the worship of the actual, material, present image, rather than that of the remote, formless, or spiritual power, of which it was the emblem or representative. It has continued, and still continues, to be in many parts of Christendom this gross and unspiritual adoration; it is a part of the general system of divine worship. The whole tendency of popular belief was to localise, to embody in the material thing the supernatural or divine power; the healing or miraculous influence dwelt in, and emanated from, the picture of the saint—the special, individual picture—it was contained within the relic, and flowed directly from it. These outward things were not mere occasional vehicles of the divine bounty, indifferent in themselves, they possessed an inherent, inalienable sanctity. Where the image was, there was the saint; he heard the prayer, he was carried in procession to allay the pestilence, to arrest the conflagration, to repel the enemy; he sometimes resumed the functions of life, smiled or stretched his hand from the wall. An image of the same saint, or of the Virgin, rivalled another image in its wonder-working power, or its mild benignity.

'On the other hand, is pure and spiritual Christianity—the highest Christianity to which the human mind can attain—implacably and irreconcileably hostile to the Fine Arts? Is that influence of the majestic and the beautiful awakened through the senses by form, colour, and expression, to be altogether abandoned? Can the exaltation, the purification of the human soul by Art in no way be allied with true Christian devotion? Is that aid to the realisation of the historic truths of our religion, by representations, vivid, speaking, almost living, to be utterly proscribed? Is that idealism which grows out of and nourishes reverential feelings, to rest solely on the contemplation of pure spirit, without any intermediate human, yet superhumanised, form? Because the ignorant or fraudulent monk has ascribed miraculous power to his Madonna, or the image of his patron saint, and the populace have knelt before it in awe which it is impossible to distinguish from adoration, is Christianity to cast off as alien to its highest development, the divine creations of Raffaelle, or of Correggio? Are we inexorably to demand the same sublime spiritualism from the more or less imaginative races or classes of mankind?

'This great question lies indeed at the bottom of the antagonism between those two descriptions of believers; to a certain extent, between the religion of southern and that of northern Europe, between that of the races of Roman and some of those of Teutonic descent; to a certain extent that of the inhabitants of towns or villages, and rude mountaineers; finally, between Roman Catholicism and Protestantism.

'But since, in the progress of civilisation, the fine arts will no doubt obtain, if not greater influence, more general admiration, religion must either break off entirely all association with these dangerous friends, and the fine arts abandon the most fertile and noblest field for their development; or their mutual relations must be amicably adjusted; a finer sense of their inherent harmony must arise; the blended feelings which they

excite must poise themselves far above the vulgar superstition of idolatry while they retain the force and intensity of devotional reverence. The causes which may be expected to work this sacred reconciliation may be the growing intelligence of mankind, greater familiarity with the written Scriptures; and, paradoxical as it may sound, but as may hereafter appear, greater perfection in the arts themselves, or a finer apprehension of that perfection in ancient as in modern art.'—Vol. ii. pp. 144—150.

The result of this controversy was the raising the power and influence of the Roman See; as Pope Gregory II. asserted and vindicated in steady opposition to the Emperor the propriety of retaining images. It is interesting as bringing out one of the last great writers of the Greek Church—John Damascene—whose history exhibits the condition of the Christians under the Mohammedan rule. The further progress of the controversy is then narrated, and then the severance of the Greek and Latin Churches under the two Gregories, which resulted in the appeal of Gregory the Third to Charles Martel, on whom the attention of all Europe centered as the liberator of the West from the 'all-conquering Mohammedans.'

'These acts of Gregory III. mark the period of transition from the old to the new political system of Europe. They proclaimed the severance of all connexion with the East. The Pope, as an independent potentate, is forming an alliance with a Transalpine sovereign for the liberation of Italy, and thus taking the lead in that total revolution in the great social system of Europe, the influence of which still survives in the relations between the Transalpine nations and Italy. The step to papal aggrandisement, though yet unpremeditated, is immense. Latin Christendom is forming into a separate realm, of which the Pope is the head. Henceforth the Pope, if not yet a temporal sovereign, is a temporal potentate.'—Vol. ii. p. 217.

At this point the author returns to trace briefly the history of the hierarchy of France during the time of the later Merovingian kings, to introduce us to the relations between the clergy and the mayors of the palace, and continues the history of the Papacy after the death of Charles Martel during the times of Pepin and those of Charlemagne, when the new dynasty stood out as the defenders of Rome against the Lombards. In it we mark the following passage, referring to the time of Pope Zacharias in the middle of the eighth century:—

'Thus for a short time longer the wreck of the imperial dominions in Italy was preserved by the sole influence, the religious eloquence and authority, of the unarmed Bishop of Rome. But such was the power of religion in those times, that not merely did it enable the clergy to dictate their policy to armed and powerful sovereigns, to arrest Barbarian invasion, and to snatch, as it were, conquests already in their rapacious hands; in every quarter of Western Europe kings were seen abdicating their thrones, placing themselves at the feet of the Pope as humble penitents, casting off their pomp, and submitting to the privations and the discipline of monks.

'It has been related that when Columban, some years before, endea-

voured to persuade the Merovingian Theodebert to abandon his throne and become an ecclesiastic, the whole assembly burst out into scornful laughter. "Was it ever heard that a Merovingian king had degraded himself into a priest?" The saint had replied, "He who disdains to become an ecclesiastic will become so against his will." The times had rapidly changed. From all parts of Western Christendom kings were coming, lowly penitents, to Rome, to lay aside the vain pomp of royalty, to assume the coarse attire, the total seclusion, and, as they hoped, the undisturbed and heaven-winning peace of the cloister. Ceolwulf is said to have been the eighth Anglo-Saxon prince who became a monk. Now, within a few years, from the thrones of France and of Lombardy, the kings descended of their own accord, and laid their temporal government down before the head of Christendom, and entreated permission to devote the rest of their lives to the spiritual state.

'Carloman, the elder son of Charles Martel, had commenced his reign with vigour, ability, and success. On a sudden he cast off at once the duties and the dignity of his station, and surrendered to Pepin, his brother, the power and all the ambitious hopes of his family. Carloman left his country, appeared in Italy, humbly requested to be admitted into the monastic state, built a monastery on Mount Soracte, but finding that too near to Rome, retired to the more profound seclusion of Monte Casino. In that solitude the heir of Charles Martel hoped to pass the rest of his earthly days.

'But Pope Zacharias beheld even a greater triumph of the faith. A Lombard king suddenly paused on the full tide of ambition and success, and from a deadly and formidable enemy of the Pope and of the Roman interest, became a peaceful monk.'—Vol. ii. pp. 231, 232.

V. The next period carries us from the time of Charlemagne through two centuries and a-half (from A.D. 800 to A.D. 1044), the early part of which was marked by great Popes—Leo IV., Nicolas I., and Hadrian II.—and by great events, while the latter part exhibits the darkest period of that Church's history, when the Papacy had sunk into the lowest state of degradation. The history of the state of the Church under Charlemagne, and his legislation, occupy a prominent place. Indeed, during all this period it is the French portion of the Church that exhibits the most life and vigour. The schools of Charlemagne awakened the minds of men. Hence it was with the French Church, most particularly under Hincmar, that the Popes had to contend. They had, indeed, other contests. The Saracens invaded Italy, and occupied the suburbs of Rome itself. The great struggle with Photius, about the See of Constantinople, followed. Nicolas and Hadrian conducted the contests both with Constantinople and France. The severance of Rome from Constantinople, and its uncontested preeminence, was the result of the one: the forged Decretals—which permanently fixed on the Church all the power which the Popes then claimed, with the authority of the apostolic age and the first three centuries—were brought) prominence in the second. Dean Milman's character of olas, and his statements on this subject, are characterised great fairness:—

'During all his conflicts in the West with the royal and with the episcopal power, the moral and religious sympathies of mankind could not but be on his side. If his language was occasionally more violent, even contemptuous, than became the moderation which, up to this time, had mitigated the papal decrees, he might plead lofty and righteous indignation: if he interfered with domestic relations, it was in defence of the innocent and defenceless, and in vindication of the sanctity of marriage: if he treated kings with scorn, it was because they had become contemptible for their weakness or their vices: if he interfered with episcopal or metropolitan jurisdiction, the inferior clergy, even bishops, would be pleased to have a remote and possibly disinterested tribunal, to which they might appeal from prelates, chosen only from aristocratic connexions, barbarians in occupation and in ferocity: if he was inexorable to transgressors, it was to those of the highest order, prelates who had lent themselves to injustice and iniquity, and had defied his power: if he annulled councils, those councils had already been condemned for their injustice, had deserved the reproachful appellation with which they were branded by the Pope, with all who had any innate or unperverted sentiment of justice and purity. Hence the presumptuous usurpation even of divine power, so long as it was thus beneficently used, awed, confounded all, and offended few; men took no alarm at the arrogance which befriended them against the oppressor and the tyrant.

'The impression left by Nicolas I. on his times may be estimated by the words of a later writer. "Since the days of Gregory I. to our time sat no high-priest on the throne of St. Peter to be compared to Nicolas. He tamed kings and tyrants, and ruled the world like a sovereign: to holy bishops and clergy he was mild and gentle; to the wicked and unconverted a terror; so that we might truly say a new Elias arose in him."

'But this vast moral advancement of the popedom was not all which the Roman See owes to Nicolas I.; she owes the questionable boon of the recognition of the False Decretals as the law of the Church.

'Nicolas I. not only saw during his pontificate the famous False Decretals take their place in the jurisprudence of Latin Christendom; if he did not promulgate, he assumed them as authentic documents; he gave them the weight of the papal sanction; and with their aid prostrated at his feet the one great Transalpine prelate who could still maintain the independence of the Teutonic Church, Hincmar Archbishop of Rheims.

'Up to this period the Decretals, the letters or edicts of the Bishops of Rome, according to the authorised or common collection of Dionysius, commenced with Pope Siricius, towards the close of the fourth century. To the collection of Dionysius was added that of the authentic councils, which bore the name of Isidore of Seville. On a sudden was promulgated, unannounced, without preparation, not absolutely unquestioned, but apparently overawing at once all doubt, a new Code, which to the former authentic documents added fifty-nine letters and decrees of the twenty oldest popes from Clement to Melchiades, and the donation of Constantine; and in the third part, among the decrees of the Popes and of the councils from Silvester to Gregory II., thirty-nine false decrees, and the acts of several unauthentic councils. In this vast manual of sacerdotal Christianity the Popes appear from the first the parents, guardians, legislators of the faith throughout the world. The False Decretals do not merely assert the supremacy of the Popes—the dignity and privileges of the Bishop of Rome—they comprehend the whole dogmatic system and discipline of the Church, the whole hierarchy from the highest to the lowest degree, their sanctity, and immunities, their persecutions, their disputes, their right of appeal to Rome. They are full and minute on

Church property, on its usurpation and spoliation; on ordinations; on the sacraments, on baptism, confirmation, marriage, the Eucharist; on fasts and festivals; the discovery of the cross, the discovery of the relics of the Apostles; on the chrism, holy water, consecration of churches, blessing of the fruits of the field; on the sacred vessels and habiliments. Personal incidents are not wanting to give life and reality to the fiction. The whole is composed with an air of profound piety and reverence; a specious purity, and occasionally beauty, in the moral and religious tone. There are many axioms of seemingly sincere and vital religion. But for the too manifest design, the aggrandisement of the See of Rome and the aggrandisement of the whole clergy in subordination to the See of Rome; but for the monstrous ignorance of history, which betrays itself in glaring anachronisms, and in the utter confusion of the order of events and the lives of distinguished men—the former awakening keen and jealous suspicion, the latter making the detection of the spuriousness of the whole easy, clear, irrefragable;—the False Decretals might still have maintained their place in ecclesiastical history. They are now given up by all; not a voice is raised in their favour; the utmost that is done by those who cannot suppress all regret at their explosion, is to palliate the guilt of the forger, to call in question or to weaken the influence which they had in their own day, and throughout the later history of Christianity.

'The author or authors of this most audacious and elaborate of pious frauds is unknown; the date and place of its compilation are driven into such narrow limits that they may be determined within a few years, and within a very circumscribed region. The False Decretals came not from Rome; the time of their arrival at Rome, after they were known beyond the Alps, appears almost certain.'—Vol. ii. pp. 372—375.

We must pass over some portion of the narrative:—

'It might occur to the most religious, that for the sake of religion; it might occur to those to whom the dignity and interest of the sacerdotal order were their religion, that some effort must be made to reinvest the clergy in their imperilled sanctity. There must be some appeal against this secular, this ecclesiastical tyranny: and whither should appeal be? It could not be to the Scriptures, to the Gospel; it must be to ancient and venerable tradition, to the unrepealed, irrepealable law of the Church; to remote and awful Rome. Rome must be proclaimed in an unusual, more emphatic manner, the eternal, immemorial court of appeal; the tradition must not rest on the comparatively recent names of Leo the Great, of Innocent the Great, of Siricius, or the right of appeal depend on the decree of the Council of Sardica; it must come down from the successors of St. Peter himself in unbroken succession; the whole clergy must have a perpetual, indefeasible sanctity of the same antiquity.

'So may the idea of this, to us it seems, monstrous fiction have dawned upon its author; himself may have implicitly believed that he asserted no prerogative for Rome which Rome herself had not claimed, which he did not think to be her right. It is even now asserted, perhaps can hardly be disproved, that the False Decretals advanced no pretensions in favour of the See of Rome which had not been heard before in some vague and indefinite, but not therefore less significant, language. The boldness of the act was in the new authority in which it arrayed these pretensions. The author may have thought that in renewing the power, while he by no means lost sight of the holiness of the clergy, he was embarked in a hallowed cause. In some respects he shows skill at least as consummate as it be expected in that age. There was no great fear of detection in a on so advantageous to those who could alone expose it, the clergy, in

an age which, for instance, received the life of St. Denys, written by the Abbot Hilduim of that monastery, and the ecclesiastical counsellor of the emperor, as identified with Dionysius the Areopagite; a legend almost of unparalleled extravagance, but which became at once accredited hagiology. The new code was enshrined, as it were, in a framework of deeply religious thought and language; it was introduced under the venerated name of Isidore of Seville (it was rumoured to have been brought from Spain by Riculf, Archbishop of Mentz); it was thus attached to the authentic work of Isidore, which had long enjoyed undisputed authority. Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, as the most powerful, so, perhaps, the most learned Transalpine ecclesiastic, who might at once have exposed the fiction, which he could hardly but know to be a fiction, co-operated more than any one else to establish its authority. So long as he supposed it to advance or confirm his own power, he suppressed all intrusive doubts; he discovered too late that it was a trap (a mousetrap is his own undignified word) to catch unwary metropolitans. Hincmar was caught, beyond all hope of escape. In the appeal of Rothrad, Bishop of Soissons, against Hincmar, metropolitan of Rheims, Pope Nicolas I. at first alleges no word of the new Decretals in favour of his right of appeal; he seemingly knows no older authority than that of Innocent, Leo, Siricius, and the Council of Sardica. The next year not merely is he fully master of the pseudo-Isidorian documents, but he taunts Hincmar with now calling in question, when it makes against him, authority which he was ready to acknowledge in confirmation of his own power. Hincmar is forced to the humiliation of submission. Rothrad, deposed by Hincmar, deposed by the Council of Senils, is reinstated in his see.

'This immediate, if somewhat cautious, adoption of the fiction, unquestionably not the forgery, by Pope Nicolas, appears to me less capable of charitable palliation than the original invention. It was, in truth, a strong temptation; but in Rome, where such documents had never been heard of, it is difficult to imagine by what arguments a man, not unlearned, could convince himself, or believe that he could convince himself, of their authenticity. Here was a long, continuous, unbroken series of letters, an accumulated mass of decrees of councils, of which the archives of Rome could show no vestige, of which the traditions of Rome were altogether silent: yet is there no holy indignation at fraud, no lofty reproof of those who dared to seat themselves in the pontifical chair and speak in the names of Pope after Pope. There is a deliberate, artful vindication of their authority. Reasons are alleged from which it is impossible to suppose that Nicolas himself believed their validity, on account of their acknowledged absence from the Roman archives. Nor did the successors of Nicolas betray any greater scruple in strengthening themselves by this welcome, and therefore only, unsuspicious aid. It is impossible to deny that, at least by citing without reserve or hesitation, the Roman pontiffs gave their deliberate sanction to this great historic fraud.

'Nor must be overlooked, perhaps the more important result of the acceptance of the pseudo-Isidorian statutes as the universal, immemorial, irrepealable law of Christendom. It established the great principle which Nicolas I. had before announced, of the sole legislative power of the Pope. Every one of these papal epistles was a canon of the Church; every future bull therefore rested on the same irrefragable authority, commanded the same implicit obedience. The Papacy became a legislative as well as an administrative authority. Infallibility was the next inevitable step, if infallibility was not already in the power asserted to have been bestowed by the Lord on St. Peter, by St. Peter handed down in unbroken descent, and in a plenitude which could not be restricted or limited, to the latest of his successors.'—Vol. ii. pp. 377—380.

The advance made in the French Church during this period is very important—it was a great step in the progress of the Church generally, and prepared the way for the changes which followed. Indeed, the life of Hincmar, the controversies which arose in that branch of Christendom, the working of the human mind shown in Gotteschalk and the disputes on predestination, indicate what advance the young and fresh civilization of the lately barbarian Franks was making. The same age saw the conversion of Bulgaria and the Slave races effected by the Eastern Church, and of the northern tribes of Scandinavia by the Latin.

How wonderful is the vitality exhibited by the Church, when on a general view of the history it appears to be utterly corrupt. The reason, doubtless, is, that while among the evil are the good—to use S. Augustine's metaphor—as the few grains of corn, scattered and lost sight of in the heaps of chaff, those few are living and influential. They show no sign of life when cursorily regarded; but they have that in them which, cast into the ground, swells, shoots up, and bears fruit an hundredfold. Nay more, when one looks at the Church of that period, and beholds it in its manifold corruptions, both in East and West, yet sending out fresh branches, it seems like some aged oak of which the trunk is hollow and decayed, and ready to die, whilst yet it retains in its frame the power of putting forth some new shoots; and to one who lived then and saw no further, it might seem as if this were all—as if these new conversions were the last efforts of expiring life—the flashings of the lamp just going out. An unbeliever in the promises and real hidden life of the Church would have said so then; but, unlike the tree, the Church had within it the power of revival and inward renewal, so that the parts which seemed decayed and ready to perish grew young again.

The history of this revival of religion throughout the Church, to which we refer, is, we think, inadequately drawn out in Dean Milman's history. We mean that vigorous and earnest working of living personal religion, which manifested itself ultimately in the Hildebrandine period and in the age of Bernard. To speak of this as a reformation only would most inadequately express its true nature. A reformation suggests the idea of outward changes—of discipline enforced, and abuses removed. The great feature of the work we speak of is, that the reformation was the result of renewed religion—whilst it was the enforcement of a discipline which persons now would regard as an intolerable burden. That it was the elevation of the ecclesiastical over the secular power is true; but if we look at the real state of Christendom, and the evils produced by the secularizing of the clergy, their subjection to a rude and

savage feudalism—and the gradual reduction by that feudalism of the spiritual offices into the condition of lay and family fiefs—the reforms we speak of appear the only possible remedy. To us the domestic life of a married clergy is one of the fairest pictures of Christian grace. In the eleventh century a priest who married was acting against the rule of the Church, and knowingly doing wrong; and secularity was the result. Such, too, was the power of disposing of the benefices of the Church by the lay powers, and the universal spread of simony. It was a corruption in the Church under which it seemed to be sinking. And the first efforts for reform were made by the Emperors themselves, and it was by the extreme exercise of their power that a series of popes were appointed who carried out that reform—only carrying it out ultimately against the Emperors themselves.

But these great outward changes were the fruit of a revival of personal religion. And one individual was the great original instrument of it, Odo of Clugny. In that house there was set up a standard of Christian life, which spread through the monasteries, and, from the monasteries, through the people of western Christendom. He who holds up a model of religious earnestness in life and conversation—be it even deformed by peculiarities, or sullied by errors—appeals to a responsive principle in the hearts of men, which never fails to answer when the right chord is touched. Berno and Odo of Clugny exhibited a reformed monastery: they did, and they awakened others to do, that which they felt to be their duty—to sacrifice this world to another, and to adopt a strict rule of life and conversation for that end. And the infection spread. One of these great monastic revivals is no light matter. It is not such a very easy or pleasant thing for men to devote themselves to silence, and seclusion, and severity. When they have long been 'settled on their lees'—living in ease and self-indulgence—expending in luxury the property bequeathed for pious uses, under the sanction which bodies corporate feel they have from established practice,—it is no easy matter to bring a whole body—say, of a college,—to adopt a strict and severe life. Yet Odo and his disciples effected this. Clugny did not, like Citeaux in the next age, send out colonies to plant new religious societies. It held out a model according to which other existing societies reformed themselves. Now, it is plain, from the men we see produced by it, and from the very fact that such a system was so adopted, that the ground of it was earnest personal religion. And where that exists it propagates itself. He who cares for his own soul, cares for those of others. The reform of Clugny awakened an earnest spirit, then, throughout

the Church; and this spirit forced reform on unwilling rulers, and forced rulers of its own temper and schooling into places of power. The rule of Clugny was followed by numerous monasteries; and many thousand persons had been trained in Clugny itself; for religious men were attracted thither, and learnt the ways of Clugny by living in it. The Carthusian order sprung up, and contemporaneous reforms took place at Camaldoli and Vallombrosa, in Italy, and at Hirsauge in Germany.

The common impression entertained of Hildebrand is, that he not only maintained certain excessive and overbearing views of ecclesiastical authority, but loved to possess that power and to exercise it himself, and that he succeeded. The fact is, that for twenty years before he became Pope, he was a most active and influential labourer in the cause of reform. But he did not seek office. Others, devoted to the reform of the Church, and latterly, those of his own school, occupied the Papal Chair: his spirit guided their government. He was himself Pope for twelve years. For the first two years he was outwardly successful. The Emperor submitted to his authority and his censure. From that time till his death he was fighting, as it seemed, at a disadvantage. He was, as it appeared, playing a losing game, and carrying on a hopeless struggle. He was hated by very many of his own people:—

'It was not indeed in Germany or Lombardy alone that the opposition to one or both the Hildebrandine decrees against lay investiture and the marriage of the clergy encountered fierce opposition. The latter, as of more immediate operation, excited the most furious passion. It was about this time that the Archbishop of Rouen, venturing to read the decree in his cathedral, was driven from the pulpit with a shower of stones. At the Council of Paris, when the decree was read, there was a loud outcry of appeal to S. Paul's Epistle to Timothy. The Abbot of Pont-Isère dared to say that the Pope's commands, just or unjust, must be obeyed. He was dragged out of the assembly, spat upon, struck in the face by the King's servants, hardly rescued alive. Everywhere, in Italy, in Rome itself, in France, throughout Germany, the decrees were received with the most vigorous or stubborn oppugnance; Gregory acknowledges the reluctance with which it was submitted to by the great mass of the clergy, the tardiness of the bishops to enforce its penalties. This, doubtless, more than the strife with the empire, the collision between the Italian and German party, was the chief source of the deep and wide-spread rancour excited in the hearts of men, rancour almost unprecedented, against Gregory VII. Later history shows Hildebrand, if not an object of admiration, of awe. Those who most deprecate his audacious ambition, his assumption of something bordering on divinity, respect the force and dignity of his character. The man who by the mere power of mind, by spiritual censures, without an army, except that which he levied by his influence over others, with enemies in his own city, aspired to rule the world, to depose the mightiest sovereigns, to raise up a barrier against the dominion of mere brute force and feudal tyranny, is contemplated, if by some with

enthusiastic veneration, by others if with aversion, as the Incarnation of anti-Christian spiritual pride, nevertheless not without the homage of their wonder, and wonder not unmingled with respect. But in his own day the hostility against his name did not confine itself to indignant and vehement invectives against his overweening ambition, severity, and imperiousness; there is no epithet of scorn or debasement, no imaginable charge of venality, rapacity, cruelty, or even licentiousness, which is not heaped upon him, and that even by bishops of the opposite party.'—Vol. iii. pp. 143, 144.

'He was not safe in Rome.' He was 'in the act of administering the Holy Communion' on Christmas Eve, when he was attacked, struck down, dragged away, imprisoned, but was again rescued by the indignant populace. Wars in Germany, wars in Italy—all seeming to be caused by his obstinacy. The Emperor was at last deposed.

'The triumph of sacerdotal Christianity, in the humiliation of the temporal power, was complete, but it was premature. Hildebrand, like other conquerors, must leave the fruits of his victory to later times. He had established in the face of Europe the great principle, the Papal power of judging kings. Henry himself seemed at first stunned by the suddenness, the force of the blow; Christendom had in like manner been taken by surprise. But the pause of awe and reverence was but brief and transitory; a strong recoil was inevitable; the elements of resistance were powerful, and widely spread. The common hatred of Hildebrand brought together again all who, from lower or from loftier motives, abhorred his tyranny: the Germans, who resented the debasement of the Empire; the Italians, who dreaded the ascendancy of the house of Tuscany; the clergy, who, more or less conscientiously, were averse to the monastic rigour of Hildebrand—those who had felt or who dreaded his censures.'—Vol. iii. p. 173.

Thus there was a great reaction, and the Pope himself was in turn deposed. The majority of the Bishops of Germany were opposed to him; and in Italy he had scarcely any Bishops to support him. Yet he stood firm to the principles he maintained. He was as firm under adversity as in success. For three years Rome was besieged. His own people grew weary of the struggle. He was virtually a prisoner, besieged in the castle of S. Angelo, and the Easter services were celebrated by a rival Pope. The Normans, indeed, recovered the city from the Emperor, but Gregory himself retired and died in exile. He did and suffered all this in maintaining a principle. But he did not enjoy the power which that principle implied. He died; and to all appearance the cause for which he laboured had failed. But he laboured for a principle which survived and prevailed, and others entered into his labours.

Now this could not have been, if there had not been in the Church a strong and decided spirit of sympathy with the cause of Gregory. It was not in the Bishops, or the beneficed clergy. They disliked reform. It was in the revived earnestness of the monastic orders, and of those who were influenced by them. It was the struggle of the few against

the many; but of the few earnest, decided, resolute men who had a principle, which, as they viewed it at least, was based on a religious ground, and commanded the sympathy of religious men. Now, it is this under-current of religious fervour to which we conceive the historian before us does not do justice. The result, when one reads the history is, that we see a great effect without an adequate cause. All the plottings—the setting one party against another—the calling in the Normans—will not account for it. We seem to be amid strange events which we cannot explain—a very unsatisfactory feeling in reading history. In the general spread of a religious spirit, which saw the unchristian corruptions which prevailed, and, wrongly or rightly, regarded the reforms pressed by the Popes as the remedy for them, together with that general temper of the age which respected the spiritual authority exercised by the Church, and openly or secretly quailed before excommunication, we must discern the cause of the ultimate success of the reformers. The first of these causes, at least, has not been brought out as fully as it ought to have been. There is a sketch of some of the causes which influenced these events, *e.g.* the general revival of intelligence and wonderful awakening of the human mind which was going on throughout Christendom; but it is placed later, to introduce the subject of S. Bernard's victory over Abelard. A full treatment of the subject would have afforded room for the genius of the historian, and have made the study of these events much more satisfactory.

The latter part of the fifth book exhibits the Roman See in its deepest degradation. But it was during this period that the seed was being sown which produced such wonderful effects. The period during which the reform of the Church of which we have been speaking was proceeding, occupies the sixth division of Dean Milman's history, in which the German Popes—the reformers antecedent to Hildebrand, and with and under whom he laboured—are treated of, and the former part of the seventh book, which contains the narrative of his own Pontificate. The rest of that book exhibits the effects of his work, from the year of despair in which the small, and, as it seemed, shattered party who were guided by him, elected as Pope the reluctant Abbot whom he had named as his successor, through the Pontificate of Urban II., around whom all Europe rallied in the first crusade. At that point the power and influence of the Pope seemed to bear all before him.

VII. The next book, however, introduces us to the history of Paschal II. and the concordat ultimately arrived at between the Church and the Empire. We then enter on one of the more beautiful and interesting portions of the work—the times of

S. Bernard,—the histories of 'the Saint, the Philosopher, and the Demagogue of the century,'—the Abbot of Citeaux himself, Abelard, and Arnold of Brescia. It is impossible to follow the author through the details of this history, in which events crowd on each other, and the most vigorous and noble characters are engaged. The following passage will be read with interest:—

'For half this century the Pope ceases to be the centre around whom gather the great events of Christian history, from whose heart or from whose mind flow forth the impulses which animate and guide Latin Christendom, towards whom converge the religious thoughts of men. Bernard of Clairvaux, now rising to the height of his power and influence, is at once the leading and the governing head of Christendom. He rules alike the monastic world, in all the multiplying and more severe convents which were springing up in every part of Europe, the councils of temporal sovereigns, and the intellectual developments of the age. He is peopling all these convents with thousands of ardent votaries of every rank and order; he heals the schism in the Papacy; he preaches a new crusade, in which a King and an Emperor lead the armies of the Cross; he is believed by an admiring age to have confuted Abelard himself, and to have repressed the more dangerous doctrines of Arnold of Brescia. His almost worshipping admirers adorn his life with countless miracles; posterity must admit the almost miraculous power with which he was endowed of guiding the minds of men in passive obedience. The happy congeniality of his character, opinions, eloquence, piety, with all the stronger sentiments and passions of the time, will account in great part for his ascendancy; but the man must have been blessed with an amazing native power and greatness, which alone could raise him so high above a world actuated by the same influences.

'Bernard did not originate this new outburst of monasticism, which had already made great progress in Germany, and was growing to its height in parts of France. He was a dutiful son rather than one of the parents of that great Cistercian order, which was now commencing its career in all its more attractive seclusion from the world, and its more than primitive austerity of discipline; which in a short time became famous, and through its fame covered France, parts of England, and some other countries, with new monasteries under a more rigorous rule, and compelled some of the old institutions to submit to a harsher discipline. These foundations, after emulating or surpassing the ancient Benedictine brotherhoods in austerity, poverty, obedience, and solitude, grew to equal and surpass them in splendour, wealth, and independent power.

'It was this wonderful attribute of the monastic system to renew its youth, which was the life of mediæval Christianity; it was ever reverting of itself to the first principles of its constitution. It seized alike on all the various nations which now formed Latin Christendom; the Northern as the Southern, the German as the Italian. In this adventurous age there must be room and scope for every kind of religious adventure. The untameable independence and individuality of the Teutonic character, now dominant throughout Germany, France, and England, still displays itself, notwithstanding the complicated system of feudal tenures and their bondage, in the perpetual insubordination of the nobles to the sovereign, in private wars, in feats of hardihood and enterprise, bordering constantly on the acts of the robber, the freebooter, and the pirate. It had been at once fostered by, and found vent in the Crusades, which called on every one to become a warrior on his own account, and enrolled him not as a

conscript, or even as a feudal retainer, but as a free and voluntary soldier of the Cross, seeking glory or plunder for himself, or working out his own salvation by deeds of valour against the Unbelievers.

'It was the same within the more immediate sphere of religion. When that yearning for independence, that self-isolating individuality was found in connexion with the strong and profound passion for devotion, there was nothing in the ordinary and established forms to satisfy the aspirations of this inordinate piety. Notwithstanding, or rather because of the completely organized system of Church government throughout the West, which gave to every province its metropolitan, to every city its bishop, to every parish its priest, there could not but be a perpetual insurrection, as it were, of men ambitious of something higher, more peculiar, more extraordinary, more their own. The stated and uniform service of the Church, the common instruction, must be suited to the ordinary level of faith and knowledge. They knew no change, no progress, no accommodation to more earnest or craving spirits. The almost universal secularisation of the clergy would increase this holy dissatisfaction. Even the Pope had become a temporal sovereign, the metropolitan a prince, the bishop a baron, the priest perhaps the chaplain to a marauding army. At all events the ceremonial of the Church went on in but stately uniformity; the most religious man was but a member of the same Christian flock; there was little emulation or distinction. But all this time monastic Christianity was in the theory of the Church the only real Christian perfection; the one sublime, almost the one safe course, the total abnegation of the monk, renunciation of the world, solitude, asceticism, stern mortification. Man could not inflict upon himself too much humiliation and misery; the true Christian life was one long unbroken penance. Holiness was measured by suffering; the more remote from man the nearer to God; all human sympathies, all social feelings, all ties of kindred, all affections were to be torn up by the roots from the groaning spirit; pain and prayer, prayer and pain, were to be the sole, stirring, unwearying occupations of a saintly life.

'All these more aspiring and restless and insatiable spirits the monasteries invited within their hallowed walls; to all these they promised peace. But they could rarely fulfil their promise; even they could not satisfy the yearnings for religious adventure. Most of the old monasteries which held the rule either of S. Benedict or of Cassian had become wealthy, and suffered the usual effects of wealth. Some had altogether relaxed their discipline, had long renounced poverty; and the constant dissensions, the appeals to the bishop, to the metropolitan, or where, as they all strove to do, they had obtained exemption from episcopal jurisdiction, to the Pope, showed how entirely the other great vow, obedience to the abbot or prior, had become obsolete. The best were regular and tranquil; they had achieved their labours, they had fertilised their immediate territory, and as though they had now but to enjoy the fruits of their toil, they sunk to indolent repose. Even where the discipline was still severe, it was monotonous, to some extent absolute; its sanctity was exacted, habitual, unawakening. All old establishments are impatient of innovation; a higher flight of devotion becomes insubordination, or a tacit reproach on the ordinary course. Monasticism had been and was ever tracing the same cycle. Now the wilderness, the utter solitude, the utmost poverty, the contest with the stubborn forest and unwholesome morass, the most exalted piety, the devotion which had not hours enough during the day nd night for its exercise, the rule which could not be enforced too strictly, e strongly competing asceticism, the inventive self-discipline, the inexustible, emulous ingenuity of self-torture, the boastful servility of

obedience: then the fame for piety, the lavish offerings of the faithful, the grants of the repentant lord, the endowments of the remorseful king—the opulence, the power, the magnificence. The wattled hut, the rock-hewn hermitage, is now the stately cloister; the lowly church of wood the lofty and gorgeous abbey; the wild forest or heath the pleasant and umbrageous grove; the marsh a domain of intermingling meadow and corn-fields; the brawling stream or mountain torrent a succession of quiet tanks or pools fattening innumerable fish. The superior, once a man bowed to the earth with humility, care-worn, pale, emaciated, with a coarse habit bound with a cord, with naked feet, is become an abbot on his curvetting palfrey, in rich attire, with his silver cross borne before him, travelling to take his place amid the lordliest of the realm.

'New orders therefore and new institutions were ever growing out of the old, and hosts of youthful zealots were ripe and eager for their more extreme demands of self-sacrifice, and that which appeared to be self-abandonment, but in fact was often a loftier form of self-adoration. Already, centuries past, in the Benedictine abbeys, the second Benedict (of Aniane) had commenced a new æra of discipline, mortification, saintliness, according to the monastic notion of saintship. But that æra, like the old one, had gradually passed away. Again, in the preceding century, Clugny had displayed this marvellous inward force, this reconstructing, reorganizing, reanimating energy of monasticism. It had furnished the line of German pontiffs to the papacy, it had trained Hildebrand for the papal throne and placed him upon it. But Clugny was now undergoing the inevitable fate of degeneracy: it was said that the Abbot Pontius had utterly forgotten the stern inflexibility of his great predecessor S. Hugh: he had become worldly, and as worldly weak in discipline.'—Vol. iii. pp. 327—331.

We have not space to extract more from these volumes, or to dwell on any other points in them. We pass to some thoughts which are suggested by the general impression which the perusal of them produces.

When one reviews the whole history of Christianity—when one calls to mind the wickedness which has prevailed in the Church, the craft, the falsehood, the violence which have attended its course, nay, have been made instrumental in carrying out its ends—when one sees the deep corruption of the clergy and people (such as that contemporary writers regarded it as the cause of the judgments of God in the irruptions of the northern tribes and the scourge of the Saracens), the prostitution of the most sacred offices, the worldly motives, nay, even the violence that prevailed in the determination of the doctrines of the Church, the continued contentions, (so that that empire which was prophesied of as 'peace,' the kingdom of heaven, which 'is righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Ghost,' seemed to be carried on by the worst arts of the worst kingdom of the world)—whilst yet the signs of life that appear in it conspire with the promises on which faith relies to assure us that this is a divine work—that the Spirit of God is, through this institution, teaching, training, sanctifying the elect of God—that it is the Church of Christ—when we realize these

facts, so strangely opposed to each other, we are overpowered by the sense of the mysteriousness and apparent contradictions which are manifested therein. The questions which naturally present themselves are these: Is this state of things compatible with the idea of the Church as revealed in holy Scripture? What did the Divine Founder of the Church lead us to expect? and how far is the truly divine character of the work of the Spirit in the Church compatible with this, its corrupt condition?

Now there is one portion of Scripture that seems specially designed to instruct us herein, where our Lord teaches us respecting 'the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven:'—'Unto you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven,' was His reply to the disciples, when they inquired why He taught in parables. The truths conveyed by those parables, which, veiled in symbolic language, were hidden from the multitude, but by Himself made known to the disciples, are, then, the mysteries of that kingdom, and the exposition of the parables explains the meaning of this expression, at the same time that it tells us what those mysteries are. They are the *mysteries of the kingdom of heaven;* not mysteries respecting the Divine Nature, or the Incarnation of the Son, or sacramental influence, but mysteries connected with that kingdom or empire which was to rise up, and spread, and outgrow the empires that had preceded it, and which was to continue for ever;—of Christianity, that is, considered, not as a body of doctrines and precepts, not as a philosophy or a moral system, nor yet as a dispensation for the salvation of man, when viewed in its internal characteristics and relations, but as externally manifested in the world, as a visible system, relating to men, influencing and ruling mankind as a kingdom or empire, rising up, propagating and extending itself, maintained in and through human agencies; having a visible and assignable extent, gaining ground and losing ground, prospering and sinking, united or divided, with successes and reverses like any other empire. This is the kingdom of heaven, grounded indeed in the hearts and souls of men, having its roots and its most real existence and power there, for 'the kingdom of God is within you,' and being in its true character, a kingdom of righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost—but externally manifested as if it were of this world, as well as in this world. And this kingdom has its mysteries. There are mysteries connected with it and involved in its very being and conditions; difficulties, inconsistencies, and contradictions apparently irreconcileable, what we should call beforehand impossibilities. That this is the meaning of the word 'mysteries' in this place—and not as some would have it, truths hidden before and now made plain—is evident from the

very truths themselves that were conveyed by the parables, and made known by our Lord to His disciples. For, in fact, these truths are the greatest mysteries, and necessarily involve such contradictions. We are so accustomed from our very childhood to say that the parable, for instance, of the Sower, represents the different ways in which the Gospel is received by different minds, that we lose sight of the mysterious fact that the Gospel, which is thus differently received, is a divine dispensation instituted for the salvation of mankind, and that the parable teaches that in the great majority of instances this institution does not fulfil its end: when the parable teaches us that the gospel is thus differently received, it teaches us that men counteract and render ineffectual the gracious designs of God for their salvation—that moral and spiritual truths do not make way or retain an influence over their hearts, and that the dispensation, in a general view, is, to a great extent, a failure;—that is, that the Almighty and Allwise would have all men to be saved, and institutes means for their salvation, and they are not saved. We cannot wonder that any theories, however strange, have been devised to account for this great mystery, whether the obstinacy of the matter on which the Divine Being had to work, or the counteracting influence of a coequal principle of evil, or His own predestination of evil and perdition.

Strange as it must have seemed to the Apostles, that the kingdom which the God of Heaven would set up, the hope of their people, of which very glorious things had been spoken by the prophets, should thus prove to a great extent a failure; surely it is not less strange to us that an interposition of God—the contrivance of infinite wisdom, goodness, and power—should, as respects the great majority of those whom it was designed to bless, prove to all appearance wholly unsuccessful; that there should be many wholly unbenefited, many making a fair promise, and for some time and in some degree seeming to be really influenced by His grace, yet ultimately without profit from it. It is an instance of that 'great waste' which there seems to be in nature; many seeds sown and few plants springing up, much blossom and little fruit. Butler notices this fact of nature as analogous to what we see in the moral world; and the spiritual, the Christian world, seems to be ruled on the same law.

Again, to instance another truth conveyed in parable, that in the kingdom of heaven, thus set up on earth, evil should exist, nay, should prevail and be allowed to continue unremoved; that not only should Christianity fail to influence men ultimately for their good, but that even within its domain, and under the profession of its name, and mixed up with and almost undistinguish-

the communication of that influence, and for the extension and preservation of the system. It was sown by our blessed Redeemer in the soil of the human mind, to draw and transmute into its own substance what was contained there, to grow and spread by what it so drew up and transmuted—and this according to the general laws of human nature and the special laws of its own being—nourished by the same gentle rain from Heaven, and the same influences of earth, as the noxious weed, or the noble yet fruitless trees that grow wildly there. The Gospel and the Church influence and are influenced by the world in which they are, according to the general laws by which the world is governed.

These are some of the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, some of the facts brought out in the history of Christianity considered as a visible system, as an external institution existing in the world. Its secret influence, its wide extension, and yet, in the case of numberless individuals, and it may be of whole portions of what once was its own domain, its entire failure;—its coming to nothing, and being as if it had never been;—the presence and continuance of evil men within it; of those who are 'offences,'—who are arguments with others for rejecting Christianity—and 'those that do iniquity;' and, lastly, its propagation, and growth, and continued life being seemingly the effect of the general laws of nature, without any apparent interposition on the part of Him who originated it — these things are mysteries, and full of difficulty. Minds there are without number that take things as they are and acquiesce in them,—some from simple faith, some from profound humility, some from a just conviction of the ignorance of man, the result of having searched out all things, and found this as the one lesson taught by all things,—but (in most instances it is to be feared), not from any profound confidence in the goodness and wisdom of God, but in a kind of inconsiderate indifference. These may see no difficulty, but when one comes really to consider these things truly, the questions that open on us are innumerable. We come to know and feel that the history of Christianity is replete with mysteries.

The reason of this we will refer to presently. Let us now observe that the fact is fully contemplated by the first promulgators of the religion. Let the evils, the scandals, the inconsistencies which the history of the Church brings in appalling distinctness before our minds, be set at the highest; the Eye which at its first introduction surveyed the course of that religion and its fruits on earth foresaw these things. The parables predicted them; prophecies, warnings, numberless anticipations distinctly taught them. The history of Christianity and the

predictions of its sacred books entirely harmonise. Be that history ever so unlike what we should have anticipated, it is not unlike what the first promulgators of it said it would be.

Take the most appalling fact of all. According to the received views of Catholic Christians—of Christians we may say of all ages—respecting the established order of the Christian ministry, whether the Episcopate or the Papacy, the difficulty which presents itself is this:—That Christ should have instituted an order of men for the highest and holiest work, to be the guides, and teachers, and the shepherds of His people; to teach, rebuke, reprove,—nay more, to be the appointed channel through which His sacramental gifts should flow to the souls of His people; to have power to open and to close the kingdom of heaven; to remit and to retain sins; to convey the gifts and graces of the Holy Spirit—and that this order of men should at any time become utterly corrupt; that individuals on whom the holiness of the Church might seem to turn should be more debased in wickedness than heathen men—should be murderers, adulterers, deceivers; and that this corruption should extend widely and continue long, whereby they who ought to guide others to good should become their corruptors—this is what was not only predicted in various forms, but distinctly intimated by our blessed Lord Himself in words of warning given to that very Apostle who specially represents the Christian ministry, and in whom his successors are inheritors of the warning as of the privileges. The following words in S. Luke (xii. 41) are evidently said with special reference to the Christian ministry in contradistinction to the people generally:—

'Then Peter said unto Him, Lord, speakest thou this parable unto us, or even to all? And the Lord said, Who then is that faithful and wise steward, whom his Lord shall make ruler over His household, to give them their portion of meat in due season? Blessed is that servant, whom his lord when He cometh shall find so doing. Of a truth I say unto you, that He will make him ruler over all that He hath. But and if that servant say in his heart, My Lord delayeth His coming; and shall begin to beat the menservants and maidens, and to eat and drink, and to be drunken; the Lord of that servant will come in a day when he looketh not for Him, and at an hour when he is not aware, and will cut him in sunder, and will appoint him his portion with the unbelievers.'—S. Luke xii. 41—46.

These words speak of a steward, one appointed as a ruler over his brother servants to tend, govern, and feed them, to give them their portion of meat in due season; and he becomes corrupt and unworthy of his high office. He possesses power—spiritual wer—he abuses it to the purposes of tyranny and of persecion; he takes advantage of his independence to indulge in ury and sensuality, participating in the vices of the most

corrupt, and wronging, scandalising and ill-treating those over whom he was appointed for good. Yet does he not thereby lose that authority or that office; he is the ruler over the household still; there is no intervention to deprive him, no sudden destruction to remove him. The complaining household may desire their Lord's interposition, they even may cry out, 'Lord, how long?' and yet He does not interpose. This condition of things is contemplated as continuing, the rulers being, as it may happen, good or evil, till the second coming of Christ. The office of the Christian minister abides independently of his abuse of it; it is not incompatible with such abuse; so that the appointed guide and ruler may be worse than any of his flock; all this Christ foresaw, and contemplated, and premonished us of as a possible event. The direct predictions of our Lord state the same truth explicitly. Those of the Apostles agree with them. And the fullest unfolding of the future condition of the Church in the book of the Revelations exhibits one series of pictures of confusion, sin, and evil predominant,—the good few in number and oppressed.

And the cause of these evils is to be found in that special feature of the Christian system, its being carried on through the instrumentality of man, combined with that great principle of the Divine government, whereby the free will of man remains unconstrained. God might, so far as we know, have carried on the work of the Gospel by the ministry of beings of another order than our own. He might have used the services of angels to be channels of grace to His Church, to teach, to baptize, to consecrate, to absolve, to support and comfort. This He has not done. Man is made the instrument of good to man. The body of revealed truth was communicated at first through men; committed to writing by men of varying abilities and natural dispositions, it is perpetuated and administered by man,—by men sympathising with men, knowing each other's wants and infirmities, and so working together. The system of truth and supply of grace in the Gospel is committed to the world in connexion with a society drawn out of the world, a society of men, framed like any other society, and having a history like any other society. Hence it is that the Church of Christ may be regarded solely in its human aspect. It may be looked on as if it were only human. It is to this law of the Christian dispensation, according to which Divine purposes are carried out by the instrumentality of moral agents, and to the freedom of those agents that these results are obviously to be attributed. In the instance of the individual Christian, the influence of Divine grace, nay, the presence of the Divine Spirit does not destroy the natural character; it is compatible

with the presence of much that is weak, sinful, imperfect in the understanding as well as the will. This is the condition ever of the holiest of men, and imperfection and occasional wrong conduct is the result. How much more when in the body of men acting together there are persons of every degree of mixed good and evil, and the majority quite evil.

Yet amid all this corruption the truth in its substance has held its place. It is with religion as with moral truth; it commands deference where it cannot gain obedience, and secures the assent of the understanding whilst the will remains rebellious. It lives on, exercises influence, recovers power where it seemed to be almost utterly destroyed.

ART. II.—*The Life of Mrs. Sherwood. By* S. KELLY. 1 vol. London: Darton & Co.

THE sphere of biography extends from day to day. We are so accustomed to see announcements of the lives of persons whose names have scarcely reached us, that it ceases to be a question as it once was, what remarkable things has such an one done, or seen, or thought that, now he has passed away, the world must be made acquainted with his private history. Rather we are arrived at the conclusion that every life is interesting if we can only have its truthful history, and to acquiesce in and even believe ourselves gainers by this communicative habit of our own time. It does not, in fact, require celebrity to make a biography either agreeable or useful; the changes of an ordinary life have enough of variety and romance in them to engage the interest of others in the like position. It only requires that these changes should have made deep impression—that the subject of the memoirs should have lived for a purpose,—and that what has been done, seen or thought, should be vividly portrayed.

In the present abundance of biographies, then, we have no need to ask why the particular one under review has been published. Every person has at least heard of Mrs. Sherwood. Many in their childhood were familiar with her works; not a few, if not of our own readers, yet of readers in general of a certain standing, have received their first notions of doctrinal religion from her fluent and prolific pen. Such being the case we took up the book with both interest and curiosity. However little we might expect to agree with the lady's theology, however little we may have sympathised with her mode of instructing young minds in Christian truth, she had influence in her day, and with a large party; and we naturally wish to know the character, and something of the history of every mind possessed of this mysterious power. But the book disappoints expectation. It is tedious and heavy, so much so, especially at the commencement, that without the stimulus of duty, which ought ever to be paramount in the reviewer's bosom sustaining him through mighty achievements of dull reading, it would be next to impossible to read it honestly through. The cause of this failure presently dawns upon the mind. An autobiography,—which this book is with the exception of a few concluding chapters by her daughter,—should be produced by a clear and accurate memory, assisted by copious notes taken at the time, either in the form of letters to friends, or of a daily record of

events. The reader soon becomes convinced that Mrs. Sherwood's memory was not a vivid one, not enough so at least to assign to each age its distinct recollections; her remembrance of persons is vague, and of the few distinguished names which occur, she remembers little more than the name. She commenced this task, too, late in life, concluding it in her seventy-third year, with many a busy bustling year of married life intervening between this period and the youth she dwells upon with a garrulous prolixity, if not with the desired distinctness. Even in the times when she kept a journal, she finds cause to regret that she made it rather a record of feeling than of fact. But present feeling is at least worth more than retrospective feeling, as being likely to be truer. With a speculative mind of a progressive order, whose pursuit, after its own fashion, is truth; experience tells us nothing is more remorseless than its sacrifices and abandonments of its former self or rather *selves*. Ambition does not kick away the ladder by which it climbed more indifferently than does the enthusiast renounce and repudiate every previous stage of progress. The step he stands on is knowledge and light and peace one day, and gross darkness the next. So, if we are to learn anything by his wanderings we prefer a current history giving the triumphs and exultations of each stage rather than the retrospect of the whole as a series of failures, which gives a fallacious idea of rest at last, of a long search resulting in a final discovery. From Mrs. Sherwood we learn little beyond her latest conclusions, and those but dimly set forth; for whether through her own mystic style or her daughter's caution, we are left to infer her meaning rather than see it anywhere distinctly stated; but we find that she had written many of her most dogmatic works, in which such as are acquainted with her writings will know that her opinions are set forth with all imaginable confidence and assurance, before she had attained to anything like what she considered distinct truth; and now and then curious admissions occur showing the slight value of even the most formal statements of persons of this temper of mind concerning their own religious history, when their theory demands them; as where, describing her spiritual state as of a school girl of sixteen or seventeen, she says:

'Now sincerely I do not believe that the ignorance in which I then lay, of anything relating to real religion, was the fault of my parents; neither do I now believe, what once I not only believed but asserted, that until my mind was partially opened to the truth after my marriage I had actually never heard that truth, either in public or in private. But this I do firmly believe, that I was not capable of receiving the Gospel while in an unregenerate state, for it is only by the enlightening and unerring influences of the Spirit one can receive "the truth as it is in Jesus." From a child *I had* read the word of God, and that word *is* truth; but I had not the moral capacity to receive anything more than an historical view of it.'—Pp. 116, 117.

And there is one even more remarkable notice of the religion of her childhood written in advanced age—as throwing an unreality on all her previous positive statements concerning her alleged unregenerate state up to mature womanhood. It is contradictory of much beside in the book, but thus it stands:—

'It would not be easy to judge of the character of a child so favourably circumstanced as I was; neither *can I myself decide* whether I had then any ideas of religion beyond what parents may teach,—in fact, beyond what may be acquired by the unregenerate mind: the time of trial was then remote, and the evil nature restrained by the gentle, yet firm, hand of a tender and wise mother.'—P. 39.

Our readers, however, will prefer some facts concerning our authoress than longer dwelling on these curiosities of feeling which are also best developed in the course of the narrative. All people are of such consequence to themselves,—every individual is so absolutely the centre and hero to himself of the scene he moves in that we can never wonder at any undue sense of importance. Indeed the strongest efforts of philosophy are not more than necessary to teach a man to estimate his own position at its due worth. When Mrs. Sherwood, therefore, prefaces her life with the following exordium, we may smile a little at the importance she attaches to the work, and muse upon the shortness of her day, and how little she knew that her influence and fame were both circumscribed within the span of her own life,—but such disparaging thoughts should be corrected by the consideration that if any one was ever encouraged to an over-estimate of self, she was. Indeed the value of such a record as she has left really lies in illustrating the mischief and injury many a gifted nature receives from being tempted to tasks and offices for which, from the very nature of things, it is unfitted:—

'I am tempted to this most singular undertaking, by an observation I have lately been induced to make upon the propensity of the age for writing and recording the lives of every individual who has had the smallest claim to celebrity. Could I be quite sure, that when I am gone, nobody would say anything about me, I should, I think, spare myself the trouble which I now propose to take; but when I consider that it is possible that dear friends, when mourning for me, may speak too partially of me, or that those who do not understand me may bring forward some of the many errors of my writings to uphold their own opinions, I feel it but justly due to Divine love and mercy to state, how, through a life of many changes, I have been gradually brought to see the truth to a point of view which is luminous indeed, and bright as the day, when compared with the twilight ray that I first discerned. The light of lights, which I now enjoy, is not a deceitful one—an ignis fatuus, or feeble emittance of fire, which can possibly lead me astray; and for this reason, that in the same measure as it burns brighter and brighter I discern more and more of the *all*-sufficiency of God, and of the total insufficiency of man. Thus, to speak in scriptural language, "The city shall have no need of the sun, for the Lamb shall be the light thereof."...

'There has been a singular Providence attending me through life, and preparing me in a remarkable manner for that which it was the Divine will I

it is *not* one of Satan's devices, but the working of pure, modest natural feeling which leads a young woman to 'kick against,' or as we should say, shrink from a marriage with a man who she knows cannot love her, but marries her from mere prudential considerations.

The marriage (it took place in the year 1773) did not prove an unhappy one as far as we can gather: yet the wife's life was evidently tinctured by this inauspicious commencement. Three children were the fruits of it, a son, the Rev. George Butt, Mary Martha, the subject of the present memoir, born 1775, and Lucy, some years younger, afterwards Mrs. Cameron, well known as sharing her sister's facility in writing. Mrs. Sherwood's style is never more awkward than when drawing the character of her parents—a difficult task to the most accomplished pen. Here we have to wade through a circumlocution of florid expressions intended to convey reverence, affection, devotion and admiration, till the thing she has really to tell lies smothered in so much decoration. We can discern, however, that her father had most of her real regard, that her vigorous nature and cheerful temperament were inherited from him. His genial love of society and success in it prevented the little sadnesses of such a home from affecting him in any way; and very early it is clear that there were more sympathies between the father and his clever daughter, than the husband with his dejected, retiring, unattractive, yet refined wife. The power of expressing affection without reserve or timidity was very likely his, as it was certainly his daughter's; and if we may judge from *her* daughter's part in this narrative, the impulse descends unabated to the third generation. His position also was one for his children to be proud of. He was popular with high and low, courted by men of rank for his social qualities; a court-chaplain, and somewhat eminent as a preacher; with a literary and reading reputation, easily won in those days; and endowed with an expansive easy benevolence of temperament which made him at home with all ranks and all persuasions. When leaving the elegant retirement of their country living, the family removed to the better preferment of Kidderminster; while Mrs. Butt shrank from the impolite associates amongst whom they were thrown, her husband's more vigorous mind moulded society even there to something congenial to his own tastes, talked himself, led the conversation, and gave his own tone to it. He was hand and glove with the dissenting ministers, and encouraged the growing liberalism of that day by such conspicuous acts of fraternisation, as could hardly be enacted now.

'My dear father's benevolent feeling had a wide play at Kidderminster. 'There were at that time, and still I believe are, many dissenters in t

forget my object. One remark, however, I must make before I dismiss this subject, and that is, that we might as readily suppose warmth and light to exist in the sun independently of all Divine power, as to attribute the enlarged charity of my father to the motions of an uninfluenced nature. To sum up his character in a few words: he was as pure in heart, as free from what is wrong, as the present imperfect state of human nature will permit.'—P. 83.

Her mother's cares bestowed on her, and they were many, were all of a more austere kind, and certainly raise a picture somewhat forbidding, though she never seems to have failed in maternal duty, and certainly not in real affection. Her system of education was one of restrictions, severities, and denials. Probably from the unhappy circumstances of her marriage, her sympathies were never fully drawn out. She lived much in herself and for a few intimate friends, and does not seem to have been able to inspire intimacy and confidence in her children. Still her daughter, with that singular mixture of real good feeling, and strong conviction that somehow the results in her own case were so good, that the means by which such results were attained must have been the best, while she carefully records all the little hardships of her childhood, assures us she would not have had them otherwise:—

'The society in which I mixed as a child was such as to give a decided turn to the thoughts and the tastes. Indeed, as long as I have lived, I have never heard any persons converse as my father and mother were accustomed to converse. My mother never suffered her children to interrupt conversation. We were compelled to listen, whether willing or not. My father not only conversed in a superior way himself, but he gave the tone to all his visitors and to all his pupils. I can hardly say how young I was when I got ideas of other countries, and other times, and other modes of life, such as, by the modern style of education, could never possibly be obtained; and this through the simple means of listening to my father's conversation. Whilst this system of improvement was always going forward whenever the family were assembled, there was a private discipline of such undeviating strictness carried on with me by my excellent mother, that it might have appeared that no other person in the world could have been better fitted to bring a mere child of many imaginations under control than was my ever honoured parent. Lady Jane Grey speaks of the severities to which she was subjected by her noble parents. I had neither nips, nor bobs, nor pinches; but I experienced what I thought much worse. It was the fashion then for children to wear iron collars round the neck, with a backboard strapped over the shoulders: to one of these I was subjected from my sixth to my thirteenth year. It was put on in the morning, and seldom taken off till late in the evening; and I generally did all my lessons standing in stocks, with this stiff collar round my neck. At the same time I had the plainest possible food, such as dry bread and cold milk. I never sat on a chair in my mother's presence. Yet I was a very happy child; and when relieved from my collar, I not unseldom manifested my delight by starting from our hall door, and taking a run for at least half a mile through the woods which adjoined our pleasure-grounds.'—Pp. 38, 39.

And again, we have the following painful picture of rough discipline:—

'My sister, as a child, had not good health, and therefore she could bear neither the exposure nor fatigue I did. Hence the reason wherefore I was so much alone. From this cause, too, she was never submitted to the same discipline that I was; she was never made so familiar with the stocks and iron collar, nor the heavy tasks; for after my brother was gone to school, I still was carried on in my Latin studies, and even before I was twelve I was obliged to translate fifty lines of Virgil every morning, standing in these same stocks with the iron collar pressing on my throat. It only wanted one to tell me that I was hardly used to turn this healthful discipline into poison; but there was no such person to give this hint, and hence the suspicion never, as I remember, arose in my mind that other children were not subjected to the same usage as myself. If my sister was not so, I put it down to her being much younger, and thus I was reconciled to the difference made between us.'—P. 54.

Iron collars and stocks have long been exploded as likely paths to the graces. At eleven years old our authoress had opened out to her a more flowery way, by a fine French lady, who paid her parents a visit, decorated in all the preposterous finery of Marie Antionette's prosperous days. The child always knew she was to be a genius, Madame de Pelevé's conversation raised the question in her, whether she was also to be a beauty, a point about which she became for the time a good deal more solicitous: indeed we may possibly trace to a visit of curiosity paid to her mirror about this time, for the purpose of ascertaining this point, those many pages devoted to the description of personal beauty which subsequently enliven even her most serious and profound polemical works.

At fifteen she was sent to school at Reading. Her father was on intimate terms with Dr. Valpy, head master of the Grammar School there, and while on his annual visit to his friend was witness of a 'sort of exhibition,' probably a theatrical performance, got up by the pupils of Monsieur and Madame St. Q——'s school, kept in the old abbey. He was delighted with all he saw, and pronounced it 'the very place for Mary,' in which judgment his daughter believed him to have been 'divinely directed,' though the whole conduct of the school was absolutely opposed to her own principles, as it would have been in many respects disapproved by all who desire any kind of religious instruction for their children. Yet it was evidently no common-place boarding-school. M. de St. Q—— possessed the art of teaching. The girls' minds were developed; they caught a tone from the place and from one another. They learned to converse; met good society of a certain class; saw much of French refugees, who flocked round their old friend, and had their minds turned towards the subjects of the time of most real interest; and, as Mrs. Sherwood insinuates, acquired

a certain grace of manner, which for ever supplanted the awkwardness of overgrown girlhood which had previously oppressed her and called down the reproofs of her friends. That the influence of this school upon young ductile minds was a powerful one, and also that it took a certain definite direction, is evident. The popular authoresses Miss Mitford and L. E. L., and Lady Caroline Lamb, who made some noise in her day, were educated by M. and Mdle. de St. Q——, though not at the same time with Mrs. Sherwood. It is curious to trace the same somewhat French glow of sentiment, the same strain of overwrought, often unreal feeling, and through all the same power of exciting interest, and engaging the sympathies of a large, though perhaps not very discriminating, class of readers, which these well-known female writers evidence through all their manifold differences of style and subject. To the one we are most concerned with, it was a charming scene of liberty and excitement, symbolized the very first morning of arrival by the privileges (forbidden at home) of free approach to the fire, and buttered toast.

No writer of her party has made it more her concern to discountenance and dispute the view of Baptism taught by our Prayer-book. No one has said more on the necessity of being able to pronounce on the precise period of conversion, from which the elect soul may date the moment of regeneration, than Mrs. Sherwood. The utter absence of reserve or timidity in approaching such subjects, the rude jarring positiveness of assertion, the unscrupulous judgment passed upon individuals and classes in respect to them, might at least lead us to expect beforehand that she herself was a signal instance to her own mind of their truth; and so, as we have said, she has somewhere stated it. Yet to us an absolutely contrary state of things is apparent, from her own self-history, of which there is evidently a curious glimmering consciousness in herself. Possibly her latest lights, as she deemed them, made the former view less necessary to her system. Be this as it may, in a certain dim way she is forced to recognise the pleadings of a divine principle in what she holds as the unconverted portion of her life. Take the following anecdote:—

'I truly believe the larger number of the girls in the highest class at Reading were certainly simple and well-intentioned. Some bad ones there were indeed, and it so happened these were in the room in which I slept. For I had not been at school many weeks, when one night, having gone to bed before the supper in the parlour, which I had the privilege of attending, I was kept from sleeping for some time by a conversation in the next bed, attended by repeated laughs.

'I knew that something bad was going on, though I did not understand all that was said. I called out, "Have done with that nonsense, or I will

terous enough, but lessons were learnt with spirit, and much was acquired beside that lessons cannot teach. Without however commending either the system itself or its results, the fact of its having possessed influence may still lead us to speculate on the fruits, as far as vigour of character and intellect are concerned, likely to accrue from the modern system of education, with its universal knowledge diffused by the same cut-and-dried means; its perpetual chatter in foreign tongues about nothing at all, which is the substitute for conversation with such as can readily learn the common-places of language; the long silence to which the less fluent are condemned, who find silence easier than to sustain a talk of platitudes with the French, or Italian, or German governess, chosen not for the fulness of her mind, but for the correctness of her accent; the sedulous occupation of every hour on some definite study or lesson in the dreary school-room: the real art of conversation all the while being as little developed by practice, or by listening to anything that deserves the name, as though a girl's native tongue was avowedly the one she is least concerned to speak well. Happily children's minds have a power of resistance, as well as an ever fresh and renovating spring within, and the thoughts have a channel, and a language of their own, unapproachable—one might say safe—from meddling interference, or the levelling, deadening influence of this training would surely destroy all the brightness and originality of its victims, and society would stand a chance of becoming too empty or too dull for its own existence.

But this digression is not intended either to recommend the Abbey's system nor its consequences on the mind of our authoress; we only point it out as an influential developing system, which all education ought to be, leaving recollections not of a mere drudgery of lessons, into which the learner could not enter, but of mind acting upon mind—a point forgotten, as it often seems now, in female education, when the inquiry about a school is not as to the degree of intellectual power of the mistress, or her skill in forming and guiding young minds, but the expensiveness and name of the masters of accomplishments.

The school days we are now upon ended in such a glow of French glitter and gaiety, as make us fully share our authoress's wonder that no harm came of it, or at least no other than the sentimental tincture, which is after all by no means the worst or most injurious point in Mrs. Sherwood's children's books. She describes a play in which she took a subordinate part, acted by the young ladies, as it seems with a kind of publicity, 'for the benefit of the distressed emigrants,' the prologue and apologue written by her father, the whole under the auspices of Dr. Valpy, calling to our minds a vivid description of similar theatrical

performances, recorded somewhere by Miss Mitford, and thus dwells on the concluding days of her school life:—

'I have many pleasing recollections of those, the few last weeks of our residence at Reading. It was bright summer weather, and whilst the days for our representation approached we lived more and more with the noble emigrants, and entered more and more into their feelings. We talked with the ladies, and danced with the gentlemen under the trees in the Abbey garden to the music of the harp. We were then, as it were, completely carried away with the spirit and feelings of France—of the olden times; and, though nominally at school, were in fact leading what Madame Genlis calls "La Vie de Château." It was not necessary that any of those who were then at the Abbey at Reading should have crossed the channel to have known what France had been under the old régime. We were even then living according to the ancient spirit, and I have often, often marvelled how it was that we, the elder girls of the establishment, were preserved as we were from serious danger, and ever treated with high respect, though too often compared to "roses," "stars," and "jewels," and all that was beautiful and rare in nature. Of course this order of things could not have lasted long, it was too much out of the way of common discretion; but so long as I and my sister remained at the Abbey, no dark cloud rolled over the bright horizon. For years afterwards some particular tunes and airs reminded me of those happy days—days only the more interesting to my young fancy from the peculiar situation at the time of the affairs of France, and especially of the royal family. War had been already declared, and thus was a colour given to the fate of many who seemed least connected with public affairs.

'I could add much more to my reminiscences of Reading.'—Pp. 118, 119.

She returned home well qualified to take her place in society; and as no one ever had advantages of any sort, however perilous or questionable, without valuing them, we find the following complacent notice:—

'The last year, and particularly the society I had kept, had made a change in me. I was not the same awkward girl I had been; and this was instantly pronounced by all who saw me. I had been much in high foreign society, and I had gained that something which can only be acquired by high society, and can never be given without frequent intercourse with good company, and perhaps I ought to add with a variety of good company. I was also then at an age when young people improve, if ever they do improve, in these respects.'—Pp. 119, 120.

The year that followed this return commenced and ended with gaieties, and was, she says, 'almost the first and the last year of any great vanity in her life.' She was admired, and, we are led to infer, had beauty enough to make some little sensation.

And now she began to fulfil her father's literary aspirations, and was detected by him in the act of composition. He eagerly seized the papers, and was delighted with this fruit of his own instructions. Eventually he made his daughter publish the novel on which she was engaged, though she had the wisdom to shrink and be averse to the publicity her name thus acquired. But history of a first work should be told in the author's own rds, that the pleasures and pains, never to be forgotten, of so

interesting an occasion may be best apprehended: if the *pains* have undue prominence given to them the little self-delusion may be excused; the more as the memoir contains very little concerning her works or literary successes. There is reason to believe the 'Mr. Smith' of the narrative to be her quondam tutor, Mr. St. Q——.

'In the meantime I went on with "The Traditions," my father encouraging me, and everybody about me leading me to think myself most highly gifted by nature; and yet let it not be supposed that it was in the article of intellect that my vanity was most easily excited. But how shall I state the case, as I conceive it to have really been? Can I possibly do it? Can any one judge of the real state of his own feelings? I will try, however, as far as I can, to explain mine. My father had impressed upon me in very early years that I was to turn out what he called a genius; and, therefore, the idea was so familiar to me, and the conviction that it was so, was a fact so strongly engraven upon my mind, that it never came upon me by surprise.

'It was a matter of course to me that I was to write, and also a matter of instinct. My head was always busy in inventions, and it was a delight to me to write down these inventions. Fortunately, however, from circumstances, and especially from reading the papers in the "Tatler" respecting Miss Jenny Bickerstaff, I had a horror of being thought a literary lady; for it was, I fancied, ungraceful, unlike a heroine, and, in short, I did not at all desire to be known as an authoress. I was far less established in the idea of my own good looks than of my talents, and one word in favour of the latter was far more precious than thousands in praise of the former. I cannot but think now, that if my dear father did not entirely deceive himself as to my powers of imagination, he certainly formed a very false estimate respecting them; for the only work of mine he ever saw finished was "The Traditions," and assuredly that work, when completed for the press, exhibited a mind very, very far from maturity. These volumes were hardly finished, as to their first rough outline, when letters came announcing the total ruin of a dear friend—an event which had for some time been expected. Even now, though years are past, I do not desire to publish the name; suffice it, my readers have seen it mentioned in this diary, and they are very dull of comprehension if they cannot trace it out. But Mr. Smith, as I shall now call him, was in much need of money, and my beloved father proposed that my manuscript should be published by subscription for his benefit. My heart sunk at the proposition; to be thus forced into public before I was of age, to be set down so soon in that character which I had always dreaded—as a Miss Jenny Bickerstaff. I was very unhappy; but then, again, to disappoint my father in his benevolent scheme, and to withhold a helping hand from the friend I so dearly loved, was impossible. I could not, and I did not, utter a denial; but really and truly I was thoroughly vexed. Many, many tears I shed in private.'—Pp. 124, 125.

For some reason Mr. Butt determined to return to his beautiful country living at Stanfield, leaving a curate at Kidderminster. This was rather a dull change for his daughters, used to so much society, the more as their mother's peculiarities, strengthened by indulgence, were evidently inimical to cheerfulness:—

'My sister and myself began now in a small degree to apprehend the effects of solitude on our mother. She liked to shut herself up from company, sitting much in her dressing-room, requiring us to amuse her. We

procured books and read a great deal, and got over every part of the twenty-four hours very well, with the exception of an hour or two at dusk. My dear mother loved this hour, and always put off having lights, and she had an objection to our sitting round near the fire, and in short she made those hours very sad, and, I must honestly say, disagreeable to us. Between dinner and tea, at tea and after tea, we again did very well, because she loved to hear us read aloud; but she always hurried us to bed, and when alone with her we never experienced anything of that little interval of cheerful conversation and freedom from restraint which in most families precedes the moment of separation and retirement for the night. Any stranger coming in would take away something of the weight of this restraint, and therefore the presence of my uncle or Dr. Salt was a benefit which we hardly could prize too highly. As to my father, he certainly was often induced to go from home to get away from this restraint; and yet our gentle and kind mother was, I am convinced, to her very last moment utterly unconscious of doing anything which could make anybody about her uncomfortable.'—P. 133.

These duller home scenes were, however, interspersed by different excitements, the commencement of another novel, a season at Bath and other matters. But now a more serious period of her life had arrived. In 1795 she lost her father, who was struck with palsy while he must yet have been almost in the prime of life, and died after a short illness, which was accompanied by all the painful circumstances of gradually clouding intellect which characterise that disorder. His loss was not only a severe one in itself, but was the commencement of a less cheerful plan of life, for Mrs. Butt, seized with the fear of poverty, and unused to act for herself, began a course of retrenchments congenial to no age, and especially chilling to youth. For a while her eldest daughter resisted this influence by indulging herself in visits at Bath, in London, and elsewhere; but soon in a better spirit she settled down with her mother and sister in the dark and dismal house at Bridgenorth, where the former had chosen their residence. After recording some passages from her mother's journal on occasion of arriving at this unattractive home, she adds the following singular comment on her own oblivion of the feelings of the period; what must unretentive memories think of their spiritual state if such a theory can be proved:—

'I have little or no recollection of what I myself thought, or felt, or said, or did at that time. And is it so, that the vain thoughts of the unregenerate child of Adam pass away from the memory and utterly perish, like the dreams of the night, which fly before the morning, and that the individual only begins really to live when the new and Divine nature is imparted? But it certainly has struck me with force, that in the early parts of my youth, where I have no journal to direct me, though I can recal many, many facts, I cannot remember much of anything of what I thought or how I felt on such and such occasions.'—P. 161.

Though her present life at Bridgenorth was dull and uncongenial, she was not of a nature to be unhappy anywhere, and here was opened to her the first of those practical means of use-

fulness to others, beyond her home circle, for which she was so well suited. The curate of their parish suggested to her and to her sister that they should take charge of a Sunday School. They threw themselves into this good work with a great deal of energy, and no doubt with unusual talent, as is shown by the lasting influence for good they obtained over their pupils. Our authoress, looking back on this 'legal' part of her career, has many caustic remarks to make on the small self-denials which characterise this stage of her history. Not only did they teach their pupils, but made clothes for them, and grudged money for any other object than the benefit of the poor who were then suffering under the extraordinary severities of the winter of 1801. For the use of her pupils she now wrote her first story for the poor, and amongst her most successful. Many may doubt the use or even propriety of so circumstantial a story as 'Susan Grey,' on such a critical and delicate subject, but we believe it was suited for the peculiar temptations of the time for which it was written, and it was received with wonderful favour by the public. She has to apologise in her autobiography for its theology, or rather to renounce it in toto; which we are not surprised at, for even in its amended form some fifteen years after its publication, this story still retains a certain sedate orthodox tone, very uncongenial with the authoress's later, we will not say maturer, works, for this quality of maturity was not to be attained by her. At this time we find the following statement of her religious condition:—

'There was evidently all this time a very strong contest going on in my mind, between the love of the world and a sense of the sin and vanity of that love. There is a period in the lives of all young girls in which they are flattered. The peculiar trial of our youth was, that my mother seldom if ever went out with us, to be our guard, and after a while she only permitted us to go out separately. There are memorandums in my old journal, from which I am taking this history, of one of these flatteries, followed by this prayer:—"Oh! my God! others may love the world, but I will follow Thee; others may follow the pleasures of this life, but I will be contented to take up my cross and follow Thee, and I will be numbered among the holy men and prophets and apostles of old."

'Then follows, the next day, a thanksgiving for having been enabled to do my duty to my God, and for having been patient, submissive, and cheerful. Here we find a double deception; first, in the resolutions formed of doing all things well, and, secondly, in the persuasion, which seems to have been entertained the next day, that all things had been so done, so far as occasion had served.

'The lesson, therefore, which in due time must be learnt by all, that man is nothing, and that God is all in all, was still to be acquired by me from its very commencement.'—P. 220.

And soon after are recorded some rules, written on occasion of her mother's leaving home for a time. We are far from disputing that possibly something may have been wrong, that

there may have been trusting in *self* at this time, yet such strivings (we fully believe earnest strivings) after a religious and consistent life must create an interest in the framer of them:—

'As soon as she was gone, I wrote a set of rules to be kept in her *absence*. 1. To rise as early as I can awake. 2. To spend my time in prayer till my mother is up. 3. To devote certain hours to my mother. 4. To read my Bible after breakfast. 5. Never to walk in the streets but when sent by my mother, or when any poor people require. 6. To go to church every Wednesday or Friday. 7. Never to indulge a worldly thought. All these rules were very well meant, and some of them perfectly right, but all were built upon a false estimation of my own powers, and a false apprehension of the Divine plans with man. As a matter of course, the account of the few next days, in which I was left alone with my mother, was only a record of the breaking sometimes of one, sometimes of another, and sometimes of all these resolutions.'—P. 221.

These mystic allusions to the 'Divine plans with man,' and the like, must, we conclude, have some reference to her recent universalist views, for ordinary Christians must believe it part of the divine plan that men should lead holy lives.

In 1803 she married her cousin, Henry Sherwood, to whose singular adventures one chapter of this work is devoted. His father, having chosen to reside in France, the son got entangled, while quite a boy, in the difficulties, and finally, in the horrors of the French Revolution, from which he escaped, at the age of from eighteen to twenty, to England, in an absolutely destitute condition. The story from his own journal recals to us Dickens' hero in a similar predicament. Some little money had been lent to him for his passage by some friend of his father's, so it chanced he was not penniless when he neared the home of his relations, by whom he could not hope to be recognised:—

"'Imagine me, then, dressed like a beggar, with my foraging cap, my old dusty black coat, minus one skirt, with no stockings nor neckerchief, asking admission on a Sunday evening at a neat tea-drinking public-house. It was no wonder they would not receive me. Exhausted and heart-broken, within ten or eleven miles of the end of my journey, having gone through so much, and now so unkindly used near home, I fell fainting at the door.

'When, after a while forgetting my sorrows, I came to myself, I found that I had been taken into the house and tenderly treated, but I did not dare tell my history there, for I was afraid, though I repeatedly said that I had no need of money.

'I recollect they gave me brandy-and-water, and I passed a quiet night, and in the morning I proceeded on foot.

'I had been taught by my father that if I showed myself in Coventry in my worn-out dress, that our family would be disgraced for ever. My business was now to get to a great-aunt, my grandfather's sister, in such manner as not to be known hereafter. How foolish we all are! just as any persons were thinking of me, or troubling their heads to recognise Henry Sherwood in the travel-soiled, wayworn beggar that I then appeared. The skin being changed, the whole animal was changed also in

an instant, for I had not the manners of the beggar. But I was very ill, and I often stopped and rested. Once, whilst leaning against a milestone, a postchaise passed, in which were two young ladies and a gentleman. The young ladies laughed at me, pointing me out, saying, "See that drunken lad."

'I was very much hurt at this remark; but I met these same young ladies at my grandmother's within the week, and they had no idea I was the same poor wretch leaning against the milestone, and I kept the story to myself.

'At Nuneaton I bought a pair of stockings, and smartened myself up as well as I could. I at length entered Coventry; but I had now forgotten the streets, and no wonder, for I had not been there since I was seven years old. The street, indeed, I at last found, but not the house. I knew, indeed, where my trustee lived, for his house was very large; my grandfather had built it, and it was called the Priory, and was sufficiently marked by its iron gates, and its relative situation to S. Michael's and Trinity Churches; but here I was ashamed to go.

'My old great-aunt I remembered well, and I walked along the street, looking in at each window to see her; at length I did see her dear old face, and I knocked very lightly and humbly at the door. It was opened, and there stood Susan—Sukey they always called her—she had been in the family before I was born. She did not know me; but was shutting to the door with "Go to the mayor, go." "I—I—I am Henry Sherwood," I said.

'Of course I was at once admitted, and at once taken to bed. The surgeon was summoned, and he pronounced my disease the scarlet fever, and I lost all recollection for days.'—Pp. 212—214.

This romantic introduction to the notice of his English friends would no doubt be a powerful recommendation to his cousin Mary, who was his senior by some two years. He was evidently struck with her from the first, and saw as much of her as he could. He entered the army when of age, and joined the 53d regiment, then stationed in the West Indies. Five years later, on his return, he made his offer, and in the same year they were married, not then knowing that the ultimate destination of his regiment was the East Indies. The marriage was a most happy one. Hers was the influencing mind: perhaps she could not have been very happy under any other arrangement, and we gather throughout, in her tone of tender patronage towards her husband, that this was acknowledged by both. It was so when she first led him to the daily reading of the Bible with her, though he had shocked her soon after their union by a confession that he did not fully believe its contents; it was so still, when she set him to work an old man with abundance of leisure, to learn Hebrew and make an Hebrew Concordance, which she says 'has prevented him from spending many and many a weary hour,' adding, complacently, 'he 'has worked at it now for many years, and is going through it 'the second time for correction.' How many husbands with nothing to do would be the better for wives so ingenious in suggestions of employment! A great deal of active service was

however to intervene between these two periods, in which we may gather that Captain Sherwood did his own duty well.

Nearly two years elapsed between their marriage and sailing for India, in which she experienced the vicissitudes and changes a soldier's wife must make up her mind to, and for which she was well suited. She was still deeply engaged on the subject of religion, which, according to her natural temperament, she pursued in a very energetic spirit:—

'My religious duties I chose to make very laborious at Sunderland. Here I had comparatively few interruptions, and much time for observing my rules. There are twenty-one daily tasks, self-appointed in my journal. Six of these are forms of prayer, three are Bible readings, and the other eleven are more secular. At this place I began to study the Bible in a regular way, though in much darkness.'—P. 250.

A great trial came, when she had to decide to leave her baby in England, and as the maternal instinct was strong in her, and she was moreover a baby lover in its widest sense, having an impulse to adopt every motherless baby that came in her way, it must have been a very keen one. Her journal written after this heavy parting, records a little lament with more simplicity, pathos, and poetry in it, than her inventive faculty in itself had ever power to conceive:—

'"The last time I saw my Mary," I find written in my journal, "she was sitting on her nurse's lap. She was eleven months and eighteen days old. Oh, my baby! my little baby! She could then walk a few paces alone. She could call mamma, and tell me what the lambs said. Oh, this state of bereavement—this parting—this life in which we are as dead to each other! My mother, my sister, you who have taken my infant under your care, you will feel for her and be tender with her. My babe will be brought up amongst lambs and flowers, among sweet woods and hills, near where her mother, who will then be far away, was brought up. She will be educated in the fear of God, if she lives; if not, she will be taken to her Heavenly Father's bosom. My beloved baby—oh, my God! bless my baby."'—P. 267.

And now commences her Indian life, which takes up at least half the volume, and contains the scenes of greatest interest in the narrative. The history of the voyage to Madras is given at full length, for our authoress, prolix always, is not likely to have mended in later life, nor to have grown more discriminating in the choice of subjects best suited for the public ear, and yet it must in all autobiographers be difficult indeed to decide on what is or is not worth telling, and this first half of the volume which we have already gone through, containing only the record of an ordinary domestic life, with no adventures beyond what may fall to any lot (for *some* changes there must be in all) presents this difficulty, in a peculiar degree, which only a very lively and graphic style can get over. A charming style carries us pleasantly

along, wherever a writer chooses to take us; but the histories of family gatherings and dispersings, the changes from town to country and from country to town, the details of journeys, the stoppages at inns, the meals, the delays, the chance companions of an hour, the little slights and little compliments, and little differences of early life, told after an interval of fifty years, in a flow of very common-place words, each incident accompanied by an appropriate religious or moral reflection—make up a book of very moderate attractions; and if our readers have followed us so far with any degree of interest they must bless the art of selection and abridgement, which gives them this pleasure at so small a cost of time and patience. Most persons engaged in the task of autobiography have mingled amongst persons well-known and remarkable in some way, but it was not so with our authoress,—a call on Mrs. Hannah More, a morning visit to Mrs. E. Hamilton, a sight of Mrs. Carter, and a dinner with Paley, all briefly recorded, are hitherto almost all the well-known names we can call to mind. It was different in India, where her own life was one necessarily of more novelty, where her peculiar gifts of active benevolence found ample and yet judicious exercise, and where she was admitted to the intimacy of men distinguished throughout the church for their zealous labours for the propagation of the Gospel of Christ. The first work in India must be the domestic one of forming an establishment, and as Mr. Sherwood's income was ample, theirs was on the usual scale of that magnificent country. But though thus relieved from every household care but that of superintendence, and, as we learn afterwards, abandoning the use of her needle for many and many a year, indolence was never one of her temptations, not even under the first influence of the heat and luxury of the new climate. Her passion was education, and very praiseworthy were her efforts for the good of all the children who at all came within her sphere. We find very early this notice:—

'In agreement with what were then my ideas of the necessity of works for salvation, instead of taking the rest in Fort William which my health and situation required, I began, after a few days, to instruct William Durham, the same little boy whom I had taught to read in "The Devonshire." I soon added another pupil, the still dearly beloved child of a friend of my husband and myself, George, the eldest son of Captain and Mrs. Whetstone, of our corps.'—P. 295.

So 'dark' was she at this period, as she informs us, that she has to record the anxieties which visited her on the subject of the baptism of the child whose birth she was looking forward to, lest there should be no ordained minister at Dinapore to confer this blessing. She made it the subject of prayer, and the prayer

was granted, for a clergyman of the Church of England chanced to be at the station at the time of the birth of her first-born son.

The careless irreligious habits of the English residents in India grieved her at this time deeply, and no doubt her influence in correcting Sunday desecration, and other errors of a like nature, was exercised for good.

'I was, however, very uneasy at the sad way in which our Sundays were spent; but I could not prevail immediately to have things altered.

'About this time a plan was formed, without any trouble on my part, for the establishment of a regimental school, and as this school afterwards formed a very prominent feature in my Indian life, I think it necessary to explain somewhat particularly how the affair originated. There was at that time no provision made by government for the instruction of the children of soldiers; but this year at a dinner party, but at whose house I cannot say, the subject being discussed, Mr. Sherwood and myself at once offered to receive the children in our quarters, if it was agreed upon that a school should be established, and Mr. Sherwood offered his clerk to assist me in the undertaking.

'The children were only to be present from eight till twelve every day, quite drudgery enough in that climate, and rather too much for me in some respects, as I was never without a baby whilst I was in India.'—P. 303.

This school, which at first consisted of eighteen pupils, soon increased to forty or fifty, consisting chiefly of the children from the barracks, and a very trying provoking little class they were, from the neglect, and the knowledge of evil in which they were trained; but such difficulties were never allowed to be any hindrance to her. It was about this time, after the birth of another child, and while sadly watching the death-bed of her first-born, that we meet with the following assertion:—

'I cannot exactly say at what time, but it was either in this month of May or of June, that, one day in conversation with our chaplain, I betrayed my total ignorance respecting the doctrine of human depravity. I seemed at times to have been astonished and dismayed by my own depravity, and this uneasiness was, of course, greatly increased by the idea which I entertained, that other religious people were free from my infirmities.

'It would be strange to think how I could have remained thus blind to this doctrine when reading the Bible, as I did every day, if we did not see this same blindness frequently at this time amongst well-meaning people.

'Our Chaplain was undoubtedly my first teacher (through the Divine Spirit) of this very essential truth, that man's nature is depraved, for he admitted this doctrine as explained in our ninth Article.'—Pp. 321, 322.

We do not know what to say to such statements as these. If a person is aware of her own depravity of heart, one great practical use of the doctrine is at least hers, nor can we understand a constant and careful reader of the Bible being ignorant to the degree she asserts, with such admonitions too, from her own conscience. Those in any way acquainted with her writings, with the harsh technicalities of her phraseology in enforcing doctrine of human depravity upon her childish readers,

must suspect that she dates more from a formula she began to use from that time, than from the first moment of conviction; her mind being no doubt open to deep religious impressions in the anguish of parting from her child. She was assisted too to dwell upon the thought by what she considers a happy stroke of imagination in personifying original sin in her 'Infant Pilgrim's Progress,' a little work on which she was then engaged.

It must be familiar to all Mrs. Sherwood's readers, that the commonest device in her plots is the adopting of orphans—a very rare occurrence in actual life, and which certainly adds to that air of unreality which characterises all her stories. It is satisfactory to find that this benevolent impulse which she attributes to mankind in general, was at least real in her husband and herself, and that they largely acted on the principle, (whether suited for general practice or not) which she so forcibly recommends. The idea first occurred to her husband after the death of their little Henry, though it could not be immediately carried out:—

'I often used to weep over my lovely, solitary Lucy. I felt very sad that this, my third child, should be alone, without brother or sister, and I permitted this regret one day to escape me in the presence of Mr. Sherwood. He was so much affected by my sorrow, that he made me a proposal which much pleased me, and which just suited my feelings. "Would you," he said, "like to adopt a little orphan from the barracks, some little motherless child, who might be a companion to our Lucy?" I rejoiced greatly when Mr. Sherwood made this kind proposition to me, and he immediately left me to make inquiries for an orphan child in the barracks.

'I can give no account of the feeling which led me so eagerly to accept his proposal, for I still had one child left with me, and I was of an age to suppose I might have many more; neither did I then thoroughly understand the condition of white orphans in India. But all that I can now say is, that it pleased God (in whose hands are the hearts of all men) so at that time to fill my heart with feelings of pity for little children, that there was no length which I would not have gone to serve them, babies especially.' —Pp. 329, 330.

However, no orphan was now to be found of an age or sex suited for her need. It was on their change of station on the route to Benares that they stopped at Dinapore and became acquainted with Henry Martyn, with whom they subsequently grew very intimate. Such an interest hangs over every record of this ardent loving spirit, that to us the few notices of him form the most engaging part of the volume, illustrating as they do, even the slightest of them, the depth and beauty of those Christian graces by which his course was actuated. Not that Mrs. Sherwood can profess entire sympathy with him; she considers him, on the contrary, in the dark, in a great many points. She thus describes her first introduction to him:—

'Mr. Martyn received Mr. Sherwood not as a stranger, but as a brother, —the child of the same father. As the sun was already low, he must needs

walk back with him to see me. I perfectly remember the figure of that simple-hearted and holy young man, when he entered our budgerow. He was dressed in white, and looked very pale, which, however, was nothing singular in India; his hair, a light brown, was raised from his forehead, which was a remarkably fine one. His features were not regular, but the expression was so luminous, so intellectual, so affectionate, so beaming with Divine charity, that no one could have looked at his features, and thought of their shape or form,—the out-beaming of his soul would absorb the attention of every observer. There was a very decided air, too, of the gentleman about Mr. Martyn, and a perfection of manners which, from his extreme attention to all minute civilities, might seem almost inconsistent with the general bent of his thoughts to the most serious subjects. He was as remarkable for ease as for cheerfulness, and in these particulars this journal does not give a graphic account of this blessed child of God. . . . .

'Mr. Martyn invited us to visit him at his quarters at Dinapore, and we agreed to accept his invitation the next day. Mr. Martyn's house was destitute of every comfort, though he had multitudes of people about him. I had been troubled with a pain in my face, and there was not such a thing as a pillow in the house. I could not find anything to lay my head on at night but a bolster, stuffed as hard as a pin-cushion. We had not, as is usual in India, brought our own bedding from the boats. Our kind friend had given us his own room: but I could get no rest during the two nights of my remaining there, from the pain in my face, which was irritated by the bolster; but during each day, however, there was much for the mind to feed upon with delight. After breakfast Mr. Martyn had family prayers, which he commenced by singing a hymn. He had a rich, deep voice, and a fine taste for vocal music. After singing he read a chapter, explained parts of it, and prayed extempore. Afterwards he withdrew to his studies and translations. The evening was finished with another hymn, scripture reading, and prayers. The conversion of the natives and the building up of the kingdom of Christ were the great objects for which alone that child of God seemed to exist then, and, in fact, for which he died. His views on these subjects were then what were entertained by all religious persons in England—views which are, I believe, generally entertained under various modifications by those who are called evangelical.'—Pp. 338, 339.

Here follows a long misty passage on the millennium, involving some of her most questionable opinions, but too obscurely for general comprehension. She continues:—

'Influenced by the belief that man's ministry was the instrumentality which, by the Holy Spirit, would be made effectual to the work, we found him labouring beyond his strength, and doing all in his power to excite other persons to use the same exertions. How far they influenced us may be seen in the sequel. I can recollect that it was chiefly whilst walking with him on the Plain, on the Saturday and Sunday evenings, that he opened his mind to us on these subjects; explaining his various plans, and the difficulties he had already met with in other matters relative to religion, which I do not exactly now remember. This, however, I can never forget, that Henry Martyn was one of the very few persons whom I have ever met who appeared never to be drawn away from one leading and prevailing object of interest, and that object was the promotion of religion. He did not appear like one who felt the necessity of contending with the world and denying himself its delights, but rather as one who was unconscious of the existence of any attractions in the world, or of any delights

which were worthy of his notice. When he relaxed from his labours in the presence of his friends, it was to play and laugh like an innocent, happy child, more especially if children were present to play and laugh with him.'—P. 340.

In the course of the same journey she became acquainted with Mr. Corrie, the great friend of Henry Martyn, afterwards Bishop of Madras, of whom also a most agreeable impression of zeal and amiable simplicity of life is given. When established at Cawnpore, the barrack school was established, and very hard Mrs. Sherwood worked in it. In a country where most English ladies thought themselves exonerated by the climate from every unnecessary exertion, it was something for a woman, who might have indulged herself in every pleasure that idleness or society could give, to apply herself to the real drudgery of a school with the patient perseverance she did, hearing four classes every day—herself clothing many of the most destitute, urging upon others the duty of helping in the cause, placing out orphans in some cases, and taking them into her own house in others, and at the same time neglecting no domestic duties, acting in all things with her husband's cordial sanction and cooperation, and tenderly devoted to her own children, whose early death in two instances were her great sorrow. These are acts which must be admired, and which must receive our approbation. After describing the reception into her own family of two interesting little orphan girls, one of whom, Annie Childe, makes a considerable figure in this part of the book, and the circumstances which led her to adopt them, we have the following incident, which gives us a good idea of the power of her influence amongst the people around her, and the way in which it worked. Hearing of a motherless baby in the regiment, who was supposed to be ill-treated and starved by the woman who had taken it in charge:—

'Having Mr. Sherwood's consent to all I did, I sent the next morning to the barracks to desire the woman who had the care of Serjeant Pownal's infant to come and bring the child to me, which, however unwilling she might be, she did not dare to refuse, and so well was I known that even the father could have scarcely withheld the child from me had he wished it. I perfectly remember the time, and where I stood when the babe was brought in. I was in the nursery; Mrs. Parker, some black women, and also the bearer who attended the children, were with me. It was noonday, and I had dismissed the school. The soldier's wife, as I said, was brought before me: she was young, sandy complexion, and hair inclined to red—a coarse and disagreeable person; in her arms she carried the child; the skin about the infant's mouth was stretched until the mouth and teeth were quite prominent; the cheeks were fallen in, the eyes staring, and the whole physiognomy that of the most eager famine. The little creature was very pale, and had very light and soft hair. The child wore a muslin frock, which had been hastily put on, and there were little long sleeves rudely attached to the short ones. The frock was clean, but the child had

no other garment that the frock. The woman looked defiance at us all when I put the question to her—"Is this child ill?" "Yes," she answered, "very ill." "I do not think it," I said; and going near to the baby to examine her more closely, she stretched out her arms to me and struggled faintly. Those little arms, and that little eager, helpless appeal, was rendered effectual by Him in whose hands are the hearts of all men, to turn and direct them to His own purposes. "And now," I said to the woman, having received the little one in my arms, "now you may go; the child needs you no more." She refused to go without the babe, and would have been very impertinent, had not the white women, with the other servants, taken up the cause, and the bearer very quietly followed her till he saw her without the gates. I must just add, that the father expressed himself truly grateful. The woman was no sooner gone than Mrs. Parker began to provide for the baby's comfort. She first bathed and dressed her, and as the poor child had not power to sit up straight, we laid her on a little mattrass, and we procured an Ayar to attend her; we gave her from time to time a few spoonfuls of very light food, such as we made for the youngest baby: but for weeks she was so ravenous that she would have eaten everything which she could lay her little hands upon. We found very soon that the child had no disease whatever, and that she was suffering merely from famine, though the wretched woman had persuaded the father that she was very ill. As I said above, he was very thankful for all I was doing for his child, and deeply grieved when he knew of her past sufferings.'—Pp. 346, 347.

At Cawnpore they were again so fortunate as to have Henry Martyn appointed chaplain of that station. She describes his arrival, brought in fainting after a long journey in the intense heat, the consequence of which was a fever, which detained him long at their house, and led of course to increased intimacy; for the warmth and friendliness of his nature, his delight in social intercourse, if at all congenial, the blending of love of God and love of man, which make his character shine out with such peculiar sweetness in every record of him, must have made a welcome and delightful guest.

The strivings after holiness of life, the morbid self-scrutiny, the sad notices of temptation, and inward struggles against the evil of his nature, which that singular record, his journal,—so valuable as a mind's true picture, so dangerous if taken as a model for general imitation,—brings to light, win even more of our sympathy, when we learn how pure, how gentle, how patient and cheerful, how beaming with Christian love the whole life of this man showed itself to all admitted to the privilege of intercourse with him. It is the simplicity of his character which these memoirs bring out: showing how naturally and unaffectedly he could adapt himself to every scene,—how readily resign himself to all circumstances—

'When Mr. Martyn got a little better he became very cheerful, and med quite happy with us all about him. He commonly lay on his ch in the hall during the morning, with many books near to his hand, amongst these always a Hebrew Bible and a Greek Testament. Soon,

very soon, he began to talk to me of what was passing in his mind, calling to me at my table to tell me his thoughts. He was studying the Hebrew characters, having an idea, which I believe is not a new one, that these characters contain the elements of all things, though I have reason to suppose he could not make them out at all to his satisfaction ; but whenever anything occurred to him he must needs make it known to me. . . . .

'In a very few days he had discerned the sweet qualities of the orphan Annie, and had so encouraged her to come about him that she drew her chair, and her table, and her green box to the vicinity of his couch. She showed him her verses, and consulted him about the adoption of more passages into the number of her favourites. Annie had a particular delight in all the pastoral views given in Scripture of our Saviour and of his church ; and when Mr. Martyn showed her this beautiful passage, "Feed Thy people with Thy rod, the flock of Thine heritage which dwell solitarily in the wood in the midst of Carmel" (Micah vii. 14), she was as pleased with this passage as if she had made some wonderful acquisition. As I have remarked in the history of my Indian orphans, what could have been more beautiful than to see the senior wrangler and the almost infant Annie thus conversing together, whilst the elder seemed to be in no way conscious of any condescension in bringing down his mind to the level of the child's?'—Pp. 357, 358.

He soon formed acquaintance with the few religious soldiers of the regiment, and established certain extempore private services with them, of which we find mention in his journals: for the peculiar practices of the school in which he had grown zealous for the truth were persevered in by him. These men had at first to go through a good deal of persecution in their regiment, on account of their religion; but the influence of the colonel, rightly exerted, stopped this. It is remarked, that when all difficulties were thus overcome, many who had been most zealous under persecution fell quite away and never returned.

'I must not omit in this place another anecdote of Mr. Martyn, which amused us much at the time after we had recovered the alarm attending it. The salary of a Chaplain is large, and Mr. Martyn had not drawn his for so long a time, that the sum amounted perhaps to some hundreds. He was to receive it from the collector at Cawnpore. Accordingly, he one morning sent a note for the amount, confiding the note to the care of a common Cooley, a porter of low caste, generally a very poor man. This man went off, unknown to Mr. Sherwood and myself, early in the morning. The day passed, the evening came, and no Cooley arrived. At length Mr. Martyn said in a quiet voice to us, "The Cooley does not come with my money. I was thinking this morning how rich I should be; and, now, I should not wonder in the least if he has not run off, and taken my treasure with him." "What," we exclaimed, "surely you have not sent a common Cooley for your pay?" "I have," he replied. Of course we could not expect that it would ever arrive safe ; for it would be paid in silver, and delivered to the man in cotton bags. Soon afterwards, however, it did arrive, a circumstance at which we all greatly marvelled.'—P. 360.

The Arab Sabat, the Christian convert employed by him to assist in his translation of the Scriptures, formed at this time part of his household. This man's subsequent apostasy and frightful death must be familiar to most of our readers. There

was a certain wild ferocity about him, and total disregard of truth at this time, which made him an object of suspicion, though his talents for his work and his religious professions, which could not be wholly hypocritical, enabled him to maintain such a hold over his employer, as certainly betrays both want of natural discernment, and the use of false tests in matters spiritual. One of his uses, however, to Henry Martyn seems to have been by his caprices and ingratitude, to strengthen and refine his great gift of patience. The description of a learned missionary's household is thus given:—

'It was a burning evening in June, when after sunset I accompanied Mr. Sherwood to Mr. Martyn's bungalow, and saw for the first time its avenue of palms and aloes. We were conducted to the cherbuter, where the company was already assembled, among which there was no lady but myself. This cherbuter was many feet square, and chairs were set for the guests; and a more heterogeneous assembly surely had not often met, and seldom, I believe, were more languages in requisition in so small a party. Besides Mr. Martyn and ourselves, there was no one present who could speak English. But let me introduce each individual separately; and first, Sabat, for whose physiognomy I recommend my readers to study any old sign of the Saracen's head which may chance to be in his neighbourhood. Every feature in the large disk of Sabat's face was what we should call exaggerated. His eyebrows were arched, black, and strongly pencilled; his eyes dark and round, and from time to time flashing with unsubdued emotion, and ready to kindle into flame on the most trifling occasion. His nose was high, his mouth wide, his teeth large, and looked white in contrast with his bronzed complexion and fierce black moustachios. He was a large and powerful man, and generally wore a skull-cap of rich shawling, or embroidered silk, with circular flaps of the same hanging over each ear. His large tawny throat and neck had no other covering than that afforded by his beard, which was black. His attire was a kind of jacket of silk, with long sleeves, fastened by a girelle, or girdle, about his loins, to which was appended a jewelled dirk. He wore loose trousers, and embroidered shoes turned up at the toes. In the cold season he threw over this a wrapper lined with fur, and when it was warmer the fur was changed for silk. When to this costume is added ear-rings, and sometimes a golden chain, the Arab stands before you in his complete state of Oriental dandyism. This son of the desert never sat in a chair without contriving to tuck up his legs under him on the seat, in attitude very like a tailor on his board. The only languages which he was able to speak were Persian, Arabic, and a very little bad Hindostanee; but what was wanting in the words of this man was more than made up by the loudness with which he uttered them, for he had a voice like rolling thunder. When it is understood that loud utterance is considered as an ingredient of respect in the East, we cannot suppose that one who had been much in native courts should think it necessary to modulate his voice in the presence of the English Sahib Logues. The second of Mr. Martyn's guests, whom I must introduce as being not a whit behind Sabat in his own opinion of himself, was the Padre Julius Cæsar, an Italian monk of the order of the Jesuits, a worthy disciple of Ignatius Loyola. Mr. Martyn had become acquainted with him at Patna, where the Italian priest was not less zealous and active in making proselytes than the Company's chaplain, and probably much more wise and subtle in his movements than the latter. The Jesuit was a handsome young man, and dressed in the complete costume of the

monk, with his little skull-cap, his flowing robes, and his cord. The materials, however, of his dress were very rich; his robe was of the finest purple satin, and his cord of twisted silk, and his rosary of costly stones, whilst his air and manner were extremely elegant. He spoke French fluently, and there Mr. Sherwood was at home with him, but his native language was Italian. His conversation with Mr. Martyn was carried on partly in Latin and partly in Italian. A third guest was a learned native of India, in his full and handsome Hindostanee costume; and a fourth, a little, thin, copper-coloured, half-caste Bengalee gentleman, in white nankeen, who spoke only Bengalee. Mr. Sherwood made a fifth, in his scarlet and gold uniform; myself, the only lady, was the sixth; and add our host, Mr. Martyn, in his clerical black silk coat, and there is our party. Most assuredly I never listened to such a confusion of tongues before or since. Such a noisy, perplexing Babel can scarcely be imagined. Every one who had acquired his views of politeness in Eastern society was shouting at the top of his voice, as if he had lost his fellow in a wood; and no less than seven languages were in constant request, viz. English, French, Italian, Arabic, Persian, Hindostanee, Bengalee, and Latin.'—Pp. 366—368.

In speaking of the many interesting conversations held about this time with Mr. Martyn and his friends, on the state and prospects of religion in India, and its more intimate concern with each soul, our authoress, alluding mysteriously, as she often does, to the new light since vouchsafed to her, says:—

'I now ask, after many years—And did these glowing and, I believe, heavenly-inspired hopes of these children of God fall short of the truth of what shall really be? Yes; for, inasmuch as the nature of man is limited, he cannot comprehend the boundless love of the Divinity. We believed that this world, at some future time, should be a holy world; and this I still believe; but I thank God that I have ceased to believe that man, unaided by the Spirit, can accomplish this mighty work, for I now know that God alone can do it. Is it not asked, "When our Lord shall come, shall he find faith on the earth?" We walked then as mere babes; and yet, I humbly trust, as children having been brought to desire to do their Father's will.'—P. 376.

What Christian ever thought that man, unaided by the Spirit, 'could do any mighty work?' But we quote this as showing the sort of assumption of inspiration which frequently occurs.

The reader of Mr. Martyn's journal must be aware of innumerable passages in which he laments and reproaches himself for the difficulty he finds in introducing religious conversation into general society. He had not arrived at the age for independent thought on such matters, and desired to act out the principles and practice of the party in the Church of which he was so bright an ornament. We must hope and believe, however, that had he lived he would have greatly modified his ideas in this respect, and proportionably changed his practice. It ought to cost a man some effort to discourse on the soul's most momentous concerns: in all deep minds it must ever do so; but with fluent shallow talkers nothing is more easy, and in intercourse

with such a mind as his nothing more delightful. There could be no deep sympathy—we, reading both their inner thoughts, may pronounce positively that there was none — between Henry Martyn and Mrs. Sherwood; but there was apparent agreement, and may she not at this period, and under the sanction at least of his practice, have begun to acquire that ease and decision in treating religious matters which, expressed in her shallow thoughtless style, often produce such insufferable results, as well to our tastes as to our deeper instincts? Common minds admitted into close intercourse with superior ones, are apt not so much to appreciate the true nature of the privilege as to value themselves upon it, and to assume a certain intellectual elevation. Henry Martyn's confessions to her, from the experiences of his inmost heart, of sin warring in him, in spite of a renewed nature, may have resulted in Mrs. Sherwood in such flippant enunciations of the doctrine of original sin as we find everywhere in her books, such as 'Yes, we are then all murderers, my dear young people,' and innumerable other similar off-hand unrealized assertions, more likely to provoke a smile in 'the dear young people' than to touch the heart or conscience.

The birth of another daughter so far decided her on leaving her husband and returning to England with her infant, that they repaired to Calcutta, and were on the point of securing her passage. As a last thought, she consulted the leading physician there, and he gave it as his opinion that the child might live for some years in India; and then follows some, no doubt, valuable experience on the treatment of English children in that climate, chiefly gathered from the observation of native women. The child did live; and on their return to Cawnpore we have more particulars of Henry Martyn and his system with the natives. He had a Sunday evening congregation of beggars, whom he *paid* for their attendance—a proceeding watched somewhat jealously by the government authorities, who had then a strange dread of interfering with the heathenism around them.

'Another of Mr. Martyn's works at Cawnpore during the late cold season was collecting together and preaching to the Yogees and Fakeers, a sort of persons who abound in every part of India, persons who, under a thin veil of superstition, are thieves, rogues, and murderers, the very vilest of the vile. It was whilst we were absent that he commenced this strange and apparently unpromising labour. Every Sunday evening the gates of his compound were opened, and every one admitted who chose to come, and then placing himself on his cherbuter, he from thence addressed these people. These Fakeers and Yogees (Mussulmaun and Hindoo saints) are organized bodies, having their king or supreme in every district. They amount to hundreds in every large station, and, as it has lately been better understood, act in concert to gull the people. Even we English, in all our

pretended wisdom, have been often deceived by them as well as the poor ignorant natives. I remember once seeing a man standing by the river side, who was said to have stood there in one attitude for many years, until his beard and his nails had grown to an enormous length, and the very birds had built their nests in his hair. We, of course, marvelled not a little at this prodigy; but we did not suspect, what has since been discovered, that this appearance is always kept up by three or four persons, who combine together to relieve guard, watching their opportunities to make the exchange when no eye is upon them. But horrid as these standing and sitting objects make themselves by wigs and false beards of matted hair, and a thick plaister of cow-dung, they are not worse, if so bad, as many that move about the country, demanding alms from the superstitious or ignorant people. The various contrivances with which they create wonder and excite compassion can hardly be believed in a Christian country. Sometimes Mr. Martyn's garden has contained as many as five hundred of these people on a Sunday evening, and as I dare not let my imagination loose to describe them, I will copy from my Indian journals what I have written of them. "No dreams nor visions excited in the delirium of a raging fever can surpass these realities. These devotees vary in age and appearance; they are young and old, male and female, bloated and wizened, tall and short, athletic and feeble; some clothed with abominable rags; some nearly without clothes; some plastered with mud and cow-dung; others with matted, uncombed locks streaming down to their heels; others with heads bald or scabby, every countenance being hard and fixed, as it were, by the continual indulgence of bad passions, the features having become exaggerated, and the lips blackened with tobacco, or blood red with the juice of the henna. But these and such as these form only the general mass of the people; there are among them still more distinguished monsters. One little man generally comes in a small cart drawn by a bullock; his body and limbs are so shrivelled as to give, with his black skin and large head, the appearance of a gigantic frog. Another has his arm fixed above his head, the nail of the thumb piercing through the palm of the hand; another, and a very large man, has his ribs and the bones of his face externally traced with white chalk, which, striking the eye in relief above the dark skin, makes him appear, as he approaches, like a moving skeleton.'—Pp. 409, 410.

This wild congregation he instructed in the moral law, and went over the Ten Commandments with them, very frequently interrupted by groans and curses. No apparent fruit resulted to them from these efforts, but he was cheered the last Sunday of his stay at that station, by finding that his discourses had made a deep impression on a young Mussulman, who, with his companions, had amused themselves by watching the scene, much at their ease, from a summer-house on the wall. This was Abdool Messeeh, afterwards distinguished for the earnest and consistent devotion of his whole life to the service of Christ.

'We often went, too, on the Sunday evenings, to hear the addresses of Mr. Martyn to the assembly of mendicants, and we generally stood behind him on the cherbuter. On these occasions we had to make our way through a dense crowd, with a temperature often rising above 92°, whilst the sun poured its burning rays upon us through a lurid haze of dust. Frightful were the objects which usually met our eyes in this crowd; so many monstrous and diseased limbs, and hideous faces, were displayed before us, and pushed forward for our inspection, that I have often made

my way to the cherbuter with my eyes shut, whilst Mr. Sherwood led me. On reaching the platform I was surrounded by our own people, and yet even there I scarcely dared to look about me. I still imagine that I hear the calm, distinct, and musical tones of Henry Martyn, as he stood raised above the people, endeavouring, by showing the purity of the Divine law, to convince the unbelievers that by their works they were all condemned; and that this was the case of every man of the offspring of Adam, and they therefore needed a Saviour who was both willing and able to redeem them. From time to time low murmurs and curses would arise in the distance, and then roll forward, till they became so loud as to drown the voice of this pious one, generally concluding with hissings and fierce cries. But when the storm passed away, again might he be heard going on where he had left off, in the same calm, steadfast tone, as if he were incapable of irritation from the interruption.

'Mr. Martyn himself assisted in giving each person his *pice* after the address was concluded; and when he withdrew to his bungalow I have seen him drop, almost fainting, on a sofa, for he had, as he often said, even at that time, a slow inflammation burning in his chest, and one which he knew must eventually terminate his existence. In consequence of this he was usually in much pain after any exertion of speaking.'—Pp. 416, 417.

There are other more domestic insights into his character which we cannot retain from our readers, though at the risk of seeming to depart too long from our main subject:—

'We spent some hours every morning during the early part of the month of September in taking short voyages on the river; for Mr. Sherwood, Mr. Martyn, and Mr. Corrie hired a pinnace, and we furnished it with a sofa and a few chairs and tables. The children went with us, and their attendants. Mr. Martyn sent a quantity of books, and used to take possession of the sofa, with all his books about him. He was often studying Hebrew, and had huge lexicons lying by him. The nurses sat on the floor in the inner room, and the rest of us in the outer. Well do I remember some of the manœuvres of little Lucy at that time, who had just acquired the power of moving about independently of a guiding hand; by this independence she always used to make her way to Mr. Martyn when he was by any means approachable. On one occasion I remember seeing the little one, with her grave yet placid countenance, her silken hair, and shoeless feet, step out of the inner room of the pinnace with a little mora, which she set by Mr. Martyn's couch; then, mounting on it, she got upon the sofa, which was low, and next seated herself on his huge lexicon. He would not suffer her to be disturbed, though he required his book every instant. Soon, however, weary of this seat, she moved to Mr. Martyn's knee, and there she remained, now and then taking his book from him, and pretending to read; but he would not have her removed, for, as he said, she had taken her position with him, and she was on no account to be sent from him.'—Pp. 419, 420.

From Cawnpore he left them to go to Persia, on his darling project of completing his Persian Testament, there to die, after two years of trial and suffering, unalleviated by human care and friendship.

'On the Sunday before Mr. Martyn left, the church was opened, and the bell sounded for the first time over this land of darkness. The church was crowded, and there was the band of our regiment to lead the singing and the chaunting. . . .

'The Rev. Daniel Corrie read prayers, and Mr. Martyn preached. That was a day never to be forgotten. . .

'From his first arrival at the station, Mr. Martyn had been labouring to effect the purpose which he then saw completed; namely, the opening of a place of worship. He was permitted to see it, to address the congregation once, and then he was summoned to depart. How often, how very often, are human beings called away, perhaps from this world, at the moment they have been enabled to bring to bear some favourite object. Blessed are those whose object has been such a one as that of Henry Martyn. Alas! he was known to be, even then, in a most dangerous state of health, either burnt within by slow inflammation, which gave a flush to his cheek, or pale as death from weakness and lassitude.

'On this occasion the bright glow prevailed—a brilliant light shone from his eyes—he was filled with hope and joy; he saw the dawn of better things, he thought, at Cawnpore, and most eloquent, earnest, and affectionate was his address to the congregation. Our usual party accompanied him back to his bungalow, where, being arrived, he sank, as was often his way, nearly fainting, on a sofa in the hall.'—Pp. 422, 423.

Mr. Corrie had been appointed to Mr. Martyn's place at Cawnpore, and the Sherwoods found him a most zealous and friendly coadjutor in their labours for the children of the regiment. Their schools increased; being added to by many half-caste children. For these children she began to write some of her best known books, which bear on life in India, teaching India-born children English ways, and giving to English children an insight into Indian life. We have not space for the little histories of her pupils, and the little orphans, more peculiarly under her charge. Many died, but all seem to have been cared for and tended with the most maternal care. She never hesitated during her residence in India to receive any child brought to her for instruction, till on one occasion the colonel of a regiment sent a band of young drummers and trumpeters to her, with his compliments, and he would be obliged to her if she would instruct them. Seeing many of these boys were taller than herself she demurred, but eventually could not resist this novel charge, and years after in England she describes a scene with these quondam pupils, then grown men, at Wheedon Barracks, who assembled round her, to confess their gratitude for her instructions and to do her honour. In the midst of these wide-spreading and onerous cares her own family occupied much of her time and thoughts. We have hitherto abstained from recording her maternal raptures, but it would be withholding one feature of her character not to extract some description of baby beauty. Beauty of all sorts, in every sex and age, was her idol. It is satisfactory that this taste was gratified in her own offspring. The loss of this darling daughter, then grown to womanhood, was still fresh in her mind when these memoirs were written; indeed she tells us it was at her instigation chiefly that the task was begun:—

'On the 20th of this month it pleased God to add another little girl to my family. This lovely child was my fifth, and, till then, I had never, only for a short and very painful period, seen two of my children together. This infant was more beautiful, but very like my precious first Lucy. It was the same fair face again; the same fine, oval, and chiselled mouth; the same bright hair and eyes, though not quite so dark. There was scarcely a fault in the exterior of this infant, and it was instantly acknowledged by all who saw her. Mrs. Mawby and Miss Corrie, on the report of her beauty, came that day to see her, and the next day the one brought her husband and the other her brother, to behold a thing so rare as a beautiful new-born babe. Colonel Mawby was not introduced to me, but Mr. Corrie came in, at my request, to baptize her, he being also her godfather. It was my wish to have called her Martha, after my mother; but when Mr. Corrie took her in his arms and heard the name, he laid her quietly down, saying in his playful way, "Then I don't christen her." "What will you please to have her called?" we asked. He answered, "Emily." "Then Emily it shall be," we replied. He took her up again, and gave her this sweet name. Oh, Emily! my Emily! My memory is fuller than my written records. My Emily grew more lovely from day to day; she became fairer and her form more full. She was so spoken of that some even of the young officers came to see her. One of these officers wrote me a note to say that if I would permit him to be her godfather he thought it might do him good, and constrain him to lead a better life than he had hitherto done; an odd idea, but there was something of good feeling in it.'—Pp. 434, 435.

Mr. Corrie was, however, soon to leave them, and Mr. Sherwood himself was beginning to conduct the Hindostanee service, into which the Liturgy had been translated, in the absence of a chaplain, when he was called off to active service, leaving family, school, and even pastoral duties to his wife; who, however, does not seem to have ever felt any call to assume active labours beyond a woman's appropriate sphere. She and a friend did indeed engage a convert to address the beggars after Henry Martyn's plan, themselves being present, but these reprobates approached the ladies with such strong indications of defiance and insult that her friend fled, and our more courageous heroine, though concealing her fears from them, and concluding the ceremony with dignified self-possession, gave up the attempt for the future, assigning herself a task more in her way than 'collecting thieves and devotees;' the result of which was 'the Ayah and Lady.'

They left Cawnpore with regret, but fresh orphans were received by them, and the onerous duties of the school were continued, till the Duke of York issued an order that each regiment should have a schoolmaster, and thus she was relieved, and at a
e when this remission of labour was most desirable. They
e beginning, indeed, to contemplate a return to England, when
Sherwood, with his regiment, was ordered from Meerat,
re they were now stationed, towards the Himalayas, against
ne of the mountain tribes, leaving the ladies and children

behind them. She gives some details of the war, which we cannot enter into. Here their situation seems to have had its dangers, not we feel sure at all exaggerated, for hers was a courageous spirit. In a letter to her mother, (with one or more trifling exceptions the only letter the book contains,) we find this passage, illustrative of the interests and alarms of this time:—

'My own Lucy is a very pleasing girl, not speaking partially; she is exceedingly sweet-tempered, and may be managed by any one—very upright and free from deceit. She has an open English countenance and complexion, and is very tender hearted. I was punishing Emily the other day; Lucy stood by reddening; at last she burst into a loud cry, saying in English, with the Hindostanee idiom, "This little sister of mine, I cannot bear to see her weep, because she is very pleasant to me." The children have a very pretty way of mixing the languages, using the Eastern idiom with the English. "Oh, my papa," she sometimes says, "my heart is full of grief for my papa, because he is gone very far." In the military life, where there is affection, the joys and sorrows are more keen and higher wrought than in common life.

'You can form no idea, my beloved mother, of the spirit which is required in the management of a family in India, particularly when the master is not at home, or rather gone out in dangerous warfare. The natives have no respect for females. Four or five men walk into the parlour, and quarrel altogether before your face, using the lowest and most abusive language, and trying in the night to frighten you with cries of alarm of thieves and fire. The night after Henry went away, one of the men appointed as a guard or watchman came to my window, close to my bed's head, setting up a great howl and firing off a gun, exclaiming at the same time in Hindostanee, "Come, come, ye thieves, come, come, and I will destroy you; I will cut you down; there they are, there they run." I thought of "Don Quixote" and the flock of sheep to which he called out so manfully, and could not help laughing, because I knew the men's tricks; but Mary and Sally and Lucy, who were in another room, were terribly scared. Some ladies in the station, who had not been so long in the country as myself, were almost frightened into fits by the alarming ways of these watchmen. I own that they have made my heart beat a little when they cry "Fire;" but of late they have kept themselves quieter, and the officer left here has been so kind as to let me have an invalid soldier of the regiment to sleep in the house, which has set all things to rights.'—Pp. 469, 470.

She had the comfort now of a visit from Mr. and Mrs. Thomason, who were travelling in the suite of Lord Moira, and of learning from them that a school for white orphans was being planned in Calcutta, under high influence: the peculiar attractions of a child of her adoption, now under the care of the Corries, having been one means of exciting a general interest on this question. We gather from her own remarks that much of the zealous anxiety which she felt at this time, and which excited her to such continued exertion, she afterwards regarded as superfluous and misplaced.

'And here I must remark, that I was often greatly distressed in my mind by the condition of these native women. I then thought that the evil of

room looking on the street, with its paper-hangings and small neat compartments, which was so strange a sight to us, that one of the little girls said "it was like a box lined with coloured paper." We ordered breakfast, and when the little creatures saw the fresh rolls, &c., they expressed such joy, that the hostess and her maids, who contrived to keep about us, were quite convulsed with merriment. The amazement expressed by these little Indians at all they saw was very entertaining, especially at the feather-beds; and when I threw the baby on one of them and she sank down laughing in it, they quite shrieked, and would have it tried again. The sights seen from the windows, too, the shops and passengers, were an infinite source of delight. . .

'Among our preparations I had not thought of a bonnet, that *sine quâ non* of English attire. The question might be asked, "Had I, in the years of absence from England, so totally forgotten English customs?" and the answer must be, "I suppose that I had."

'Facts are stubborn things. I did not think of these said bonnets, nor did I avail myself of the Saturday to prepare them. There are odd people in the world, and ever have been, and I must be content to sit down among them; my conduct on this occasion leaves it without a doubt.

'On Sunday morning, June the 2d, we were gladdened by the sound of bells calling the people to church. I should have thought it very wrong, after all our mercies, with the memory fresh of the fearful storm of that day fortnight, not to have gone to attend Divine service. So, without hesitation, bonnetless as we were, I went with three of my little girls to a fine church near the inn, and heard a good preacher. His subject was the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. We were put into a seat in the centre of the church. Some old ladies in Liverpool still talk of the Indian family who appeared that day, looking so remarkable with their Indian shawls and lace caps, being apparently and really unconscious of their *outré* appearance. After having been at church, we, with the rest of our family, took a walk in the town, followed by a concourse of people, all of whom looked favourably upon us as the first-fruits of the port, and smiling on the fair children from a far-off land.'—Pp. 511—513.

On rejoining her mother, she found her eldest child, whom she had left an infant, grown almost into womanhood. It was arranged that they should settle near Mrs. Butts, now in very declining health. Mr. Sherwood had leave of absence for two years, and now a natural difficulty presented itself, whether, for the sake of maintaining their present income, he should return to India, or decide to remain with his family on straitened means, a real inconvenience to every member of a household accustomed to all the luxuries and attendance they had been trained to. In this emergency her love of active occupation suggested the plan of increasing their income by taking pupils. Though known as an authoress, she had not thought of this as a means of adding to their resources, though it is implied that eventually her literary occupations proved very remunerative. She liked the society of young people; had clearly none of that love of domestic privacy which makes the admission of strangers to the home circle so great a trial to many, and was happy in her husband, always ready to fall in with and admire her schemes.

judgment had filled her with terror, that she felt she could never stand the judgment of an all-pure and all-seeing God, and that above all things she wished to hear what M. Malan would say on the subject. I had ever taught my child that the Lord the Saviour would preserve her in judgment if she trusted in Him; but as I had very imperfect views myself at that time of what the Saviour had done, my instructions had failed of giving her satisfaction. In fact, I may say, I fear with truth, that I was then very unable to give a reason for the hope that was within me; for I was clinging to one great and general error—that man had some condition to fulfil, on the non-fulfilment or fulfilment of which his salvation must depend.

'M. Malan was scripturally grounded in his views of the perfection of the Divine work, as it regarded the elect, and of the perfect and entire safety of those individuals who are adopted into the body of Christ, and of the total impossibility of their ever being suffered finally to fall away, and hence of the absolute duty of entertaining the doctrine of assurance. On this point, that is, in showing the fulness of Christ as regards His own chosen ones, and the perfect confidence such should place in Him, M. Malan worked hard to instruct my young ones, and what he said was blessed not only to them but to me.

'Never shall I forget his playful address to my young daughter, when next we met. "*Eh, bien! ma petite demoiselle, vos oiseaux de nuits le sont-ils volés.*" '—Pp. 548, 549.

Can we regard it as otherwise than shocking to every feeling of reverence, thus to find a minister of the Gospel ridiculing to a young mind, the terrors of that awful judgment day which his Lord and Master himself sets before us for our lasting warning and continual contemplation? It must be noted, too, that a kind of hereditary claim to salvation is here acknowledged, and a spiritual aristocracy implied. It was because this young girl was Mrs. Sherwood's daughter, that he taught her to despise all questionings of her soul's state and final destiny as birds of ill-omen; for he could scarcely assert, that under no circumstances, and by no reasonable being, should such thoughts be ever entertained. But such things speak for themselves.

The following is Mrs. Sherwood's comment, or rather inference from M. Malan's teaching. Our readers must make of it what they can, it is obscure enough; but antinomianism, universalism, and all sorts of ugly isms beside may be supposed to lie hidden in it, as well as in the following reflection, which we find further on:—

'But this little chasm in my diary admonishes me how impossible it would be for the most correct person to recover and set in order the events of a life of more or fewer years with perfect accuracy, if a few months are so impossible to remember. And oh, how infinitely awful must it be to believe, as the conscience-stricken legalist must do if he is not an infidel, that every idle word that he has ever spoken is recorded against him; the infinite mind being thus brought in terrible array against the finite. Thank God, however, that to me the veil of goatshair has been removed from the face of the Sun of Righteousness.'—Pp. 561, 562.

And then she added, solemnly and clearly, as she bent more over his hand than mine, "Remember this, my children, that God is love. He that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him."

'These were the last intelligible words I heard her utter; for when I saw her again, at four in the morning, death had began its work, though she called me by name, for she knew me.

'I am told by those who could observe the scene that her sufferings were not severe, but though present I can remember nothing of it but that its sorrows made me motherless.'—P. 599.

We have purposely not dwelt longer upon this and similar closing scenes. They contain nothing really remarkable, and yet are of so intimate, and as most would consider, of so private a nature, that the mere reading public ought not to be concerned with them. In what may be termed domestic biography we are sorry to perceive natural reserves more and more laid aside, and the details of family affection, and particulars which should belong only to those most closely connected by the ties of blood or friendship, set forth in print, and exposed to every eye. The details of a parent's suffering, unless some great lesson is to be learnt from them, ought not to be told beyond the sphere of sympathisers—such narratives ought not to have the chance of being indifferently listened to, or carelessly turned over. But this is both a delicate and a difficult subject.

When a life has been passed in the mixed employment of a course of active duties and engagements, and the indulgence of speculative opinion, action will have been found to influence the habits and temper far more than speculations which probably were taken up, and laid down with the pen, the use of which itself becomes in time just so much daily business. Thus, a cheerful amiable old age tells nothing for the truth or effect, one way or another, of those vain dreamy notions which distinguish this authoress's later writings. Nor can we tell to what degree they influenced the inner mind at all. Heretical notions are constantly more influential on the learner than the teacher; on the learner alone do they bear their natural fruit.

In dwelling on a life like this before us, a strong sense of regret remains. We see that a mistake was made both by Mrs. Sherwood and her admirers; she mistook her powers, and was encouraged to misapply them. Her ready, trite, fluent pen, with its power of weaving endless stories,—common-place and full of faults it is true, but with the desideratum of interesting young minds,—was found a valuable party instrument all the more for the want of depth and real thought, which for party purposes are both troublesome things.

It was considered a fine stroke of satire in Molière, to announce to the verse writers of his day, 'The History of Rome in a series of madrigals;' but in our youth it was believed to be

the best way of inculcating the great and awful doctrines of our Faith, to set before children a course of sentimental tales, wherein beautiful girls and fine young men act out for their edification the breach and the observance of the law of God. For the aim Mrs. Sherwood had in view, neither her mind, nor her education, nor, we will add, her sex, at all fitted her—and so that fate befel her which Dante foretels to all who meddle in subjects beyond their depth,—

> 'Vie piu che indarno da riva si parte,
> Perche non torna qual ei si muove,
> Chi pesca per lo vero e non ha l'arte.'

Had her powers been more modestly directed, they might have done good service; for we are constantly surprised in her writings to meet with excellent practical good sense, side by side with arrogant and unfounded presumption and visionary allusions. When she wrote from her own experience, she constantly wrote well and usefully; when she trusted to her supposed deep insight into spiritual things, she as constantly failed. An example of both styles will illustrate our meaning better than further explanation. Mrs. Sherwood was herself, we doubt not, a good and conscientious economist of time, and therefore, from her own practice and observation, she expresses herself wisely in the following passage. We extract from the first volume of the 'Lady of the Manor:'—

> 'From the time that the infant first draws its breath, until that awful period when the soul forsakes its breathless body, each flitting moment brings with it a certain obligation to the performance of some particular exercise—some unhappy temper is to be restrained; some important lesson to be learned; some new faculty to be acquired; or some latent power to be brought into use. And they who daily endeavour to execute the present task appointed by the all-wise Creator, looking up to him in simple dependence upon His promised assistance, will seldom find that overwhelming accumulation of duties, or that perplexing hurry of business of which so many complain; for the yoke of the Almighty in itself is easy, and his burden light; as all His faithful servants have found in all their generations. Our duties are generally set before us one by one; and commonly speaking, the means of performing these duties are supplied at the same time. A mother has seldom more than one child at a birth; and before her family becomes large, abundant leisure, and space, and opportunity, are given her to mould her first-born child with the Divine blessing into a faithful and powerful instrument for the management of the rest, as well as into a lovely pattern by which its genius may be mutually and sweetly led forward from one degree of excellence to another. But the careless or indolent parent or housekeeper, she who has failed in youth to fit herself for future duties, and who in her early married state has neglected the performance of her little daily tasks of instruction and correction, or of personal labour and inspection, will cetainly find herself at length plunged into an abyss of cares and troubles, from which she can never expect to be extricated till she has reached the close of a wretched and wearisome life.'—*Lady of the Manor*, vol. i. p. 140.

This is all extremely sensible and true, and moreover, has that freshness about it in spite of some formality of style that all individual thought has. The next from the same work is a specimen of her powers of assertion, and that privilege of sitting in judgment upon others, in which she so freely indulged, without, certainly, any real data to go upon, for the unhappy young ladies whose state is here so glibly pronounced upon —such as had come under Mrs. Sherwood's observation,—were not likely in the presence, and under the eye of so distinguished a person, to allow themselves in any open improprieties. She must have been guided by some self-chosen unwarrantable test.

'But the greater part of young ladies in England, even the daughters of religious families, give no evidences of being converted, and are, I fear, only kept from open and flagrant offences by motives of worldly prudence, family restraint, custom, and shame.'—*Ibid.* vol. i. p. 269.

This is only one instance of many of the practical business-like nature of her mind, employing itself in the uncongenial field of speculation: anything like doubt or hesitation was alien to her mind; she could be in no person's company without deciding on their spiritual state; she could not entertain the idea of being mistaken, nor see any reason for withholding her convictions from the world as soon as formed; and as in persons so in doctrine, she decided upon these as easily, with as little deliberation, with as full conviction, (if we may misapply the term to this state of mind,) with as free a condemnation of those who differed from her as she could pronounce sentence on a human soul for some act of conformity or nonconformity contrary to her own judgment.

And for a time, this habit gave her weight and influence. It all passed for bold and uncompromising assertion of the truth. While the graces and accomplishments of life, the received customs of society, and what are called worldly amusements were her theme, however ignorantly and indiscriminately condemned, persons, satisfied on the whole, did not think it their part to criticise her mode and style of attack, and much less when she acted with them against certain views of doctrine to which they were opposed, and where she was found an efficient auxiliary. It was only when this habit made such head against all restraints as to turn her round upon her own friends, that the mischief of this arrogant self-reliance was felt and acknowledged; and in the official organ of her party, she was admonished to *humility,* and told that 'pride of intellect had gone before her fall.'[1]

There is no reason to suppose that either advice or admonition were of any avail; she evidently, in the latter years of

[1] Christian Observer, 1837, p. 306.

her life, considered herself lifted above the ordinary risks of humanity, and we find her thankful for having been preserved from self-conceit (p. 544), when we cannot but regard her as the real victim of that delusion.

It is time, however, to draw our notice to a conclusion. If in her day she had influence, it may be considered passed, nor can her works, characterised by a trite and common style, ever revive to have real weight. Her system of religious teaching has, we suspect, been found on all hands to be a failure. Her perpetual repetitions of doctrine in the same dull prosy formula, were invariably passed over altogether, or if forced upon her young readers, read with weariness and disgust. Her unreal generalizations on the depravity of human nature were found ineffectual preachers of humility; and even risked deadening the conscience, thus taught to regard sin simply as a condition of our being, and so scarcely to be guarded against, or repented of. Her mystic notions of prophecy and the millennium, so far from producing good, were felt to foster irreverence in childish minds. Her indiscriminate condemnation of many practices in their nature indifferent, and, if not abused, blameless, tended to mystify the instincts of right and wrong; and people found, moreover, that after ever so careful and conscientious a perusal, reading all the didactic parts, and skipping nothing that was dull, what remained longest, and left the most real impressions from her books, was their strong appreciation and exaltation of beauty, wealth, rank, elegance, and all worldly advantages whatever.

Thus, years enable men to see the faults and failures of books, characters, and institutions in highest favour in their own day. Reflections of this kind must be suggested to all thoughtful readers by the present work. Only let us recognise the redeeming element of good intention, not wanting in even the most objectionable of Mrs. Sherwood's works, and, remembering the labours, charities, and kindnesses which distinguish her active career, our severest comments and harshest criticisms will not be given in an uncharitable spirit, nor without much genuine admiration and sympathy for the vigorous, cheerful, affectionate spirit which has here been brought before us in its more congenial sphere of life and action.

ART. III.—1. *A Letter to a Convocation Man, concerning the Rights, Powers and Privileges of that Body.* 4to. 1697. *Edited, with an Introduction and Notes, by the Rev.* WILLIAM FRASER, B.C.L. J. Masters, London. 1853.

2. *The Authority of Christian Princes over their Ecclesiastical Synods asserted, with particular respect to the Convocations of the Clergy of the Realm and Church of England, occasioned by a pamphlet entitled, 'A Letter to a Convocation Man.' By* WILLIAM WAKE, D.D. 8vo. 1697.

3. *The Rights, Powers, and Privileges of an English Convocation, stated and vindicated in answer to a book of Dr. Wake's. By* FRANCIS ATTERBURY. 8vo. 2d edition. 1701.

4. *Ecclesiastical Synods and Parliamentary Convocations of the Church of England, historically stated and justly vindicated from the misrepresentations of Mr. Atterbury.* Part I. *By* WHITE KENNET, D.D. 8vo. 1701.

5. *A History of the English Councils and Convocations, and of the Clergy's meeting in Parliament. In which is also comprehended the History of Parliaments. By* HUMPHREY HODY, D.D. 8vo. 1701.

6. *Synodus Anglicana, or the Constitution and Proceedings of an English Convocation, shown to be agreeable to the principles of an Episcopal Church.* 8vo. 1702. *Edited by* EDWARD CARDWELL, D.D. *Principal of S. Alban's Hall.* The University Press, Oxford. 1854.

7. *The State of the Church and Clergy of England in their Councils, Synods, Convocations, and other public assemblies, Historically deduced from the conversion of the Saxons to the present Times. By* WILLIAM WAKE, D.D., *occasioned by a book entitled, 'The Rights, Powers, and Privileges of an English Convocation.'* Fol. 1703.

OF the books on Convocation, which we have placed at the head of our article, two have been lately edited and reprinted, and the others must shortly be so by what we may call a literary necessity. The revival and reform of Convocation is not one of the least important questions even of this eventful time; but it

brought before the public mind, and appears almost incumbent upon a churchman to acquire so much knowledge of the subject as to be able to judge fairly of the extent, the tendency, and the possible results of the Reforms which have been proposed.

We will suppose then that our reader feels desirous of forming some of his own opinions on the probable efficiency of Convocation in its present state, or in a reformed one; and that in order to do so he has recourse naturally to some of the Convocational writers of the period when it was in full activity. He will find it a work of controversy as a thing of course; and the enquiry will involve the perusal of some other writer on the other side of the question, probably more voluminous. Here again he will meet with unsatisfactory references to other books, some folios, some pamphlets, which he will find next to impossible to obtain: however interested in the question he at first has been, he will lose the clue to the feelings and objects of the writers, and become confused and bewildered among the chaos of theories and counter-theories, isolated facts and undeveloped principles, forms which are taken for granted as familiar to him, and practices which have for some time been obsolete; until in weariness and impatience he relinquishes the task, and is driven in mere despair to take his notions on Convocation from the common-places of the orators of the platform.

In order then to save readers on Convocation some amount, even if it be but a small one, of such labour and perplexity, we propose now to lay before them some brief critical and historical notices of our principal writers on Convocation; and while going over their works to throw what light we are able upon that rude and undigested, but yet very valuable, mass of controversial writing, which, during the reigns of William III. and Anne, formed itself round them by successive accretions, which has a style and unity of its own, and which we may therefore reasonably enough distinguish as 'Our Convocation Literature.'

Now if the muse had ever smiled on us, and if we had been ever touched with the fire of creative genius, we might paint the fortunes of this Synodal controversy in hues of poetic brilliancy; we might celebrate its wordy warfare in the glowing life and language of another Iliad; we might describe its combatants skirmishing at a distance or closing hand to hand, one while hitting a foe with the heavy spear of an 'Examination,' at another extending over a fellow-partisan the sevenfold shield of a 'Defence;' on this side, a flight of 'Letters' might be seen hurtling through the darkened air, and on that a warrior crushing his opponent with a 'Reply' in the form of a folio, which to lift only would take two men, such as men now are. Hector and Achilles might find apt parallels in Gibson and in Atterbury,

and the Homeric element of occasionally prosy speeches would assuredly not be wanting. Or if our fancy were in a more sombre mood, we might imagine ourselves as guiding our reader's steps, as Virgil guided the exile of Florence, aiding his feet to find out the zigzag path through that intricate and obscure controversy.

> 'Noi salevam per una pietra fessa,
> Che si moveva d'una e d'altra parte,
> Sì come l'onda, che fugge e s'appressa.—
> Qui si convien usare un poco d' arte.'
>
> *Purgatorio*, canto x.

And all the while there have been flitting before us the forms of sarcasms, whose life has gone, innuendos now unintelligible, and animosities which have been long since dead; and before us lay crowded in ghostly confusion, forgotten arguments, shadowy principles and theories which have mouldered into dust; and a region opened to our view, dark indeed, and unknown in its extent, yet not without something which allured us to advance in its very vastness and obscurity—The Purgatory of Pamphlets.

The popularity which William of Holland enjoyed at the beginning of his reign had been gradually diminishing, until, after the death of Mary II., it was superseded by an almost general feeling of distrust and opposition. Many causes led to its decline; among the most obvious were the expenses of the wars in which he was engaged, his own unenglish manners, the attempts which his advisers made to revive the policy of the Stuarts and adapt it to the altered circumstances of the times, and not least perhaps, the suspicions which were entertained of the hostility of the king and his ministers to the Established Church. It was of course the object of the Tory party to foment this unpopularity by any means within their reach; and the demand of justice for the Church was one of the most obvious as well as the most specious. To many an earnest churchman this was a real motive for exertion; but to others it was only a cry, and was never intended for anything else. If we bear this in mind, it will serve as a key to many of the anomalies of policy which astonish us in the history of the Convocations of that time, where we find both the opponents and the friends of Convocational action complaining again and again, that no advantage resulted from the sessions of that assembly, either to the Church or to religion itself. It was intended that it should be so. The leading men of the day, while they were out of office, supported the claims of the Church, for the purpose of exciting a feeling against the government; and when they obtained office themselves, though they rewarded the men who had been their in-

struments, they considered it their interest to render nugatory the efforts they had seemed to make before. Here is one clue to some of the proceedings which seem so inconsistent and purposeless, and we imagine that we can perceive another in the influence, which the vacillating court at S. Germains exerted upon the intriguing and political portion of the clergy: for all the nation intrigued; and the clergy of those days most certainly did not deserve the encomium that was passed upon that model divine, who 'never troubled any body about either politics or religion.' The Church it is true was strong; but it was the strength of fever rather than of health, which was followed by the reaction of the Georgian era: and if it was not in danger from without,—and remembering Burnet's Comprehension scheme, we can hardly say that it was not,—it was in a most divided and unhealthy state within.[1] The Bishops, with not more than two or three exceptions, had been 'judiciously chosen,' and were Whigs, and devoted to the court. The country clergy were Tories, and though not precisely what Macaulay describes them, were yet behind the working clergy of the present day in intelligence and freedom from prejudice; though they might equal them in zeal, and were certainly their superiors in influence. The dignified clergy were, upon the whole, men of a high standard of earnestness and intellectual power. These were the picked men of the Church, and were the leaders of the rest of their order: for to be 'a safe man' was not then a necessary qualification for preferment; and that combination of mediocrity of talent with moderation of sentiment, which constitutes 'the safe man's' character, was hardly then appreciated. They were 'high' in their views of the Church, though they would differ in many points from 'the high-churchman' of to-day; and if they were sufficiently zealous in defence of purity of doctrine, yet they were always too much inclined to place the temporal privileges of the Church on a par with, or even above, her spiritual power and divinely-given authority.

That element, too, which is so valuable in a church, of high principled although obstinate conscientiousness, had been lost by the secession of the non-juring clergy, though their movement had not yet assumed the character of a schism; and those of the clergy who had taken the oaths, while their feelings and their

[1] 'Some steps have been made, and large ones too, towards a Scotch Reformation, by suspending and ejecting the chief and most zealous of our bishops, and others of the higher clergy; and by advancing, upon all vacancies of sees and dignities ecclesiastical, men of notoriously Presbyterian, or, what is worse, of Erastian principles. These are the ministerial ways of undermining episcopacy; and when to the seven notorious ones shall be added more upon the approaching deprivation, they will make a majority; and then we may expect the new model of a church to be perfected.'—*Somers' Tracts*, vol. x. p. 368.

interest were still with the exiled family, were discontented with their position and restless in their aims. Their views, especially on the point which had been up to that time a fundamental of Anglicanism, 'passive submission,' were thrown into utter confusion, and they were exposed to the temptation, to which many of them succumbed, of allowing plans and contrivances of purely worldly policy to supersede in their minds the true interests of the Church and the honesty and reality of religion. The restoration of legitimate monarchy became their leading principle, rather than the advancement of the Gospel. The Whig clergy on the other hand chiefly consisted of those of the Puritan party who had conformed; but the old earnest spirit of Puritanism had died out among them, and they had taken up the establishmentarianism of the Church of England without its Catholic principles. They were eager assertors of the secular authority of the Episcopate, while they denied or doubted its apostolical institution; and their servility to a *de facto* sovereign was unadorned by the chivalrous notion of a 'Divine Right' in kings. They worshipped power; and they were shortly to be, if they were not already, known as the 'Low Church' party.[1] In the nation, while profligacy of morals was still the vice of the many, philosophical unbelief was becoming that of the few; and in the Church the anti-popery controversies of the preceding reign had been succeeded by restlessness and even recklessness of speculation on the highest mysteries of the Faith; and Sherlock, and Bury, and Locke, and Burnet—in spite of a ukase from William on the subject—rationalized upon the TRINITY, as upon any other matter of metaphysical discussion; while Woolston and Toland and a host of minor infidels assailed Christianity itself.

This was much the social and ecclesiastical aspect of 1696, when a pamphlet was published, urging most strongly the revival of synodal action in the Church as a remedy for the existing evils; and asserting by arguments from the analogy between a Parliament and a Convocation the right of the latter to exert its legal powers for the maintenance of Christian truth, and the punishment of its impugners. This pamphlet Mr. Fraser has lately edited for the use of readers of the present day. Written with boldness, and even with violence, yet 'A Letter to a Convocation Man' does not appear to have been intended to be, what it certainly proved to be, the first shot fired in a long and hard-fought controversial campaign. It was rather an *argumentum ad homines* addressed to the patrons of representative institutions and liberty of debate; and an attempt to show that the power of the

[1] The earliest instance of the use of this term which we at present remember, is 'The Character of a Low Churchman.' 4to. 1702. By Dr. Sacheverel. After that date it is very common.

Crown, which had been resisted even to revolution when it was formerly exerted to suppress or to keep in abeyance the power of Parliament, was with very great inconsistency still exerted to suppress a deliberative assembly of equal antiquity with Parliament, and possibly in its own sphere of equal utility. This argument was put with fairness enough, and with force enough; and its legal monotony was varied with[1] allusions and covert sarcasms which did not spare the highest personage in the state. The letter was anonymous, but the writer—who was not a clergyman, for he speaks of himself as a Member of the House of Commons, and as being present at the presentation of Peter Foley as speaker, in 1694—is considered, on we think sufficient grounds, to have been Sir Bartholomew Shower, a legal writer of some eminence, although Macaulay speaks of him slightingly. His pamphlet is stated to be intended as an answer to three questions—

'I. What occasion there is at present for a Convocation?

'II. What law there is that commands or prevents them sitting and acting but the absolute free pleasure of the Prince?

'III. Of what validity their acts and resolutions are, unless confirmed and approved by Parliament?'

In treating the second of these questions, he touched upon a fact which the succeeding controversy brought into no slight prominence. It is this,—in the writ by which the bishops are summoned to Parliament, there is a clause warning them to bring their Dean and Archdeacons in person, and their Chapter and diocesan clergy by proxy to Parliament with them, 'to consent to the things' which should be then ordained. The writer of the letter, after quoting the writ, says no more than that it seemed to him 'certain that the præmunition or warning 'mentioned in this writ, being to those who are members of and 'constitute the Lower House of Convocation, is an argument of 'invincible strength to establish the necessity of Convocations 'meeting as often as Parliaments.' This inference seems fair enough: but the matter was not to rest so quietly.

William III. was annoyed by both the matter and the style of the 'Letter to a Convocation Man,' which had not only marked out limits for his ecclesiastical supremacy, but had even ventured an innuendo against his private religious character; and it was therefore necessary that it should be answered as quickly as possible. A pamphlet of some small merit, under the title of 'A Letter to a Member of Parliament,' appeared before long in reply, written by a barrister named William Wright, who was

[1] 'And for his Majesty's good-will, we do not, I say, we will not, in the least doubt of it: though some who would be thought to understand his mind best are pleased in all companies to admire and celebrate a prince of no religion as the best of governors: for which saucy insinuation we hope, in time, that vengeance will find them.'—*A Letter to a Convocation Man*, p. 22.

Recorder of Oxford; but the task of refuting it was assigned to Dr. Wake, who, even if it were against his inclination, undertook it with an obedience which was not likely to lose its reward. Wake was a man in every way fitted for the work, by his extensive reading, and was endued, as a controversialist, with perseverance and earnestness; yet he was unfortunate in having the post assigned to him of combating—as he really was, however, he might disguise it to himself—against the Synodal rights of the Church. He lost no time. Within a few months he published his 'Authority of Christian Princes over their Ecclesiastical Synods,' by which he intended to silence the writer of the 'Letter to a Convocation Man.' This book showed an amount of learning upon a subject which up to that time had been but little investigated, which was more than respectable, although it was hurried in its style and somewhat confused in the arrangement of its facts—faults which he himself pleads guilty to. The great point which he wishes to establish is that Convocation is an occasional assembly, meeting only by the will of the Crown, for such purposes as the Crown shall direct; and that this is what it ought to be. To prove this he goes through all the nations of the civilized world, one after the other, endeavouring to show, as a general principle, from the practice of each of them, that the sovereign alone possesses the irresponsible right of prescribing the persons who are to be called to a Synod, the time and the place of their meeting, the matter of their debates, the form in which they should conduct them, and the way of their being dissolved. This is doing too much; and the reader finds his process of induction tedious rather than conclusive. He then applies the same method to the Convocation, and limits it by the same principle. He had here to meet the universal consensus of English lawyers that the clergy formerly sat in Parliament, and afterwards were for conveniency separated into a distinct house. He allows that it was so, and gives the following account of that assembly, which, however, he does not recognise as the Convocation:—

'When in the twenty-third year of Edward I. the constitution of the Parliament came to be settled, as now it is, the inferior Clergy were put upon the very same foot that the Commons were in it. And as with respect to the one a writ was issued out to the sheriff of each county to return a certain number of knights, citizens, and burgesses; so with relation to the other a clause was inserted into the writ of the Bishop of the Diocese, to send the Dean of his Cathedral and Archdeacons in person; and out of the Chapter and Archdeaconries, to choose such a number of Proctors as was thought sufficient to represent the Clergy of each Diocese in it. . . . . From the sixth of Edward III. the Clergy have continued to be as duly and constantly summoned to Parliament as the Commons themselves have been. Indeed, so evident is the truth of this, that our greatest lawyers and antiquaries do not deny the inferior Clergy to have been once a Member of the Parliament. . . . . That upon such times as the whole Parliament met and as long as they continued to sit together, the Proctors of the Clergy met together with them, is not to be doubted.

Their writs summoned them to the same place and upon the same business; and we cannot doubt but that they met accordingly, at the opening of every Parliament together. Whether upon the decision of the two Houses, as the Bishops continued to sit with the one, so the Proctors of the Clergy did also sit at first, with the other, I am not able to say. But from the time that they had a distinct Prolocutor of their own, we must conclude that they met distinctly. And upon all the divisions we meet with, in the most ancient rolls of Parliament, the method still was for each estate to consult together, Lords Temporal by themselves, the Commons by themselves, and the Bishops and Clergy by themselves. And when we consider the method, that has been taken, from the beginning, of summoning each of these to Parliament, how the Temporal Lords have their writs particularly directed to them, the Commons theirs directed to the Sheriff of each county, and the Bishops and Clergy theirs joined together, it may seem not improbable, that as they were summoned after a distinct manner to the Parliament, so they sat too; and that the Bishops and Proctors of the Clergy not only occasionally consulted together, but ordinarily acted as one of the Three Estates of the Realm there too.'—*Authority of Christian Princes*, pp. 209—221.

But as the fact had to be accounted for that the Convocation, even if it were shown not to be as much a part of the constitution as the Parliament, which 'A Letter to a Convocation Man,' had maintained it to be, yet was by ancient custom summoned together with Parliament, Wake cut through the difficulty by asserting that the chief end for which the clergy was assembled by the Crown was to obtain money from them. At the same time he admits that if the Crown should persist in refusing the Clergy the liberty of assembling when the state of the Church required it, then the Bishops and the Clergy should set both law and power on one side, and discharge those higher duties which the necessities of the Church imposed upon them. There was, however, through the whole book such an obvious spirit of subservience to the Court party, and passages in it are marked by such an obtrusion of the absolute power of the Crown in spirituals, such hard language, and such a tone of objugation towards the Clergy in general, and especially towards those who might be conceived to be opposed to his views, that it could not but be expected but that an opponent, whenever he might arise, would seize such a convenient handle for raising a prejudice against the book, and for stigmatizing its principles as slavish and unconstitutional; and Wake himself[1] seems to have had some reason for expecting its condemnation by both the House of Commons and the Lower House of Convocation.

Before the year was out, one part of the argument of the 'Authority of Christian Princes' was replied to in 'Municipium[2]

[1] He writes, Jan. 23, 1701 :—'Once it was seriously, I believe, resolved to have had me censured in both Houses of Commons Spiritual and Temporal.'—*Nicolson's Correspondence*, vol. i. p. 217.

[2] 'Municipium Ecclesiasticum; or, the Rights, Liberties, and Authorities of the Christian Church asserted against all Oppressive Doctrines and Constitutions, occasioned by Dr. Wake's Book.' 8vo. 1697.

policy of the Government towards the Church. Wake then found an antagonist in the champion of the High Church party, whom it was no mean thing to encounter—

'Impiger, iracundus, inexorabilis, acer.'

The theory which Atterbury was desirous of establishing was that the Convocation was summoned to assemble, primarily if not solely, by the Crown writs, which were sent to each individual Bishop, and not by the Archbishops' mandates, which he looked upon as a mere formal addition. He traced the history of these Crown writs, or rather that peculiar clause in them, which commences with the word *Præmunientes*, down from the time of Edward I.; and by documents and writs collected with the greatest industry and arranged with the greatest art,[1] for which his opponents insinuated he was indebted to others. He laboured to prove that the Convocation is a necessary part of the Parliament, and one of the estates of the realm. And from these principles he endeavoured to deduce the practical conclusions, that the Convocation ought, as a matter of right, to sit for the transaction of business, along with, and as often as, the Lords and Commons; that all measures regarding the Church ought to begin in Convocation as regularly and invariably as money-bills begin in the Commons, and that the Church had need of the Convocation, because she had a right to it. He himself states the propositions which his book was intended to demonstrate as follows:—

'I affirm and have proved, that the Convocation has a right not only to be summoned, but to meet with every new Parliament, and to be opened in due form by Divine Service and a Sermon. That the Clergy of the Lower House, when thus met, have a right of filling the chair of it with a Prolocutor, and of being put into a condition of doing business. That if they have any requests, any motions to make to my Lords the Bishops, the King, or his great Council, for the good of religion, or the redress of Church grievances, they have a right to make them; to enter into what debates, and come to what resolutions they shall think fit, within their proper sphere, without being obliged to qualify themselves for such debates or resolutions by a Royal licence, which is necessary to no Synodical act, previous to that of making or enacting a Canon. That in these respects and to these purposes, the Convocation is still a Parliamentary body, and an essential part of our constitution, called both by the clause in the Bishops' summons, and by writs directed to the Archbishop of either Province, which clause and which writs, whenever a new Parliament is to meet, can no more by the rules of our Constitution be omitted, than the writs for the Lords and Commons can. In short, that not only the King

[1] Nicolson says in a letter of Ap. 11. 1700:—'The materials of this learned piece were, I am told, prepared by Dr. Hutton, of Aynhoe, but they were put together by a pert gentleman of Christ Church, who has shown himself to have a much greater share of wit than logic.'—*Nicolson's Correspondence*, vol. i. p. 174.

Again, Ap. 13,—'An insolent bungling and illogical compiler; for it is most apparent that the antiquary and the jack-pudding are two several persons.'—P. 176.

has a right of thus calling the Clergy to attend, but the Clergy also have a right of attending, and the Lords and Commons a right of being attended by them.'—*Rights, Powers, and Privileges*, p. 503.

And then he concludes his book with an epinician apostrophe to Wake—

'This is the doctrine, briefly laid down in that letter, which first gave rise to this debate; and is, in these papers more fully explained and proved. If Dr. Wake can show wherein any part of it disagrees with the laws and usages of this kingdom let him do it: if he cannot,—as I am certain he cannot—he is obliged by his own proposal to submit, that is to own himself utterly mistaken throughout this dispute, and publicly to retract his illegal and slavish opinions.'—P. 504.

He also analyses the Act of Submission, by which the Clergy had been fettered by Henry VIII., with an amount of legal acumen which is surprising in one who had not made the law his study; and in addition to his general subject elucidates by the way many obscure parts of our ecclesiastical history and government. The subject, apart from its importance, would seem to be unattractive enough, yet Atterbury contrives to relieve its inherent dryness by the vigour and piquancy of his style. At one time he indulges in a tirade on the principles of constitutional liberty with a mimicry which must have been rather provoking to the Whigs of the day; at another he deals out the most unsparing blows to his opponents. Not Wake only, but Archdeacon Nicolson and Bishop Burnet each come in for their share; and he varies his manner according to the man he is dealing with. Charity is not his strong point evidently. Burnet he treats with ironical deference; Nicolson with a contempt which is almost good-humoured; and Wake with a sneer, and sarcasm, and invective, lavished in succession with no unsparing hand. This must have told immensely in Atterbury's own day, for the reader now can, after more than a century and a half, hardly choose but laugh at the hits which he gives so sharply and so heartily.

The book was known to be Atterbury's, though it appeared without his name, and was received with a general welcome by the High-Church Clergy. Atterbury was rewarded by his University with the Doctorate, and Convocation was summoned to meet again in 1701 mainly in consequence of his exertions. Yet the publication was not without danger at the time. Writing to Bishop Trelawney, whose chaplain he was, Nov. 12, 1700-1, tells him—

'week the Judges were called together, and my Lord Chief Justice th earnestness proposed to them a declaration of the sense of the sion act in opposition to what I have written; and a censure of the s intrenching on the King's prerogative. The proposal stuck with Some of them had not seen the book, others had not read it, and

all required time; and so the matter stands at present. He proposed it, as I understand, with an intimation as if such a declaration and answer would not be unwelcome to the king.'

He seems to have set but little store by the literary attacks which he anticipated. Writing to Mr. Newey, Jan. 18, 1700-1, he says—

'When you come to town, you will be entertained with answers of all sorts to my book. Dr. Hody has one just upon the point of coming out in two thick octavo volumes of about seventy sheets of paper, which he calls 'A History of Convocations.' Another gentleman has, by order, wrote and printed a good part of another. It is to be of about two or three hundred pages; and is to be a first part only, two more being to follow. And this gentleman is ordered to use me rudely, and to put as much gall as he can into his ink. Dr. Hody is to be in the meek way. The design of both is, to open Convocation with a clamour against the book, just at the very nick of its meeting; so that I shall not be able to answer. After all, Dr. Wake is to come, when the Convocation is up, with a mighty folio. Under all this threatening news I thank God I am in heart.'—*Atterbury's Correspondence*, vol. i. pp. 53, 65—67.

The first writer who took the field against him was Burnet. On June 29, in the same year, he published some 'Reflections'[1] on Atterbury's work, chiefly in vindication of his own History of the Reformation, though he also states his own views concerning the nature of a Convocation, and the relations which the Presbyterate bears to the Episcopate when they are assembled in Synod. He defends the policy of William toward the Clergy, supposes that Atterbury had not owned his book for fear of 'engaging past retreat,' and in choice railing language, choice that is for a Bishop, he abuses his opponent for his abusive style.

Kennet was the next. His 'Ecclesiastical Synods and Parliamentary Convocations' was but the first part of a much larger work, of which three parts were originally contemplated, and in which he purposed to attack Hill as well as Atterbury, and to refute the *Jus Divinum* of Synods which the former had so strongly advocated. The two latter parts never appeared, but the one we have forms an almost complete work, and displays much research and well-digested knowledge on the subject of Convocations. He was Atterbury's equal in bitterness, but not in wit; and the value of the book is lessened to a modern reader by his constant efforts to attack some proposition that Atterbury had not advanced, or to abuse him personally. But notwithstanding these drawbacks it is indispensable to the

[1] 'Reflections on a book entitled the Rights, Powers, and Privileges of an English Convocation, by Gilbert, Lord Bishop of Sarum.' 4to. 1700.

In the beginning of the next year appeared a 'Letter to a Convocation Man, from a Clergyman in the country.' Signed W. B., Jan. 1700. This was written by Dr. Binckes, and appears to have been sometimes confounded with the first 'Letter to a Convocation Man,' from which it differs in both matter and style.

Convocational student, because it distinguishes with considerable plainness and care the two elements of which our Convocations have been formed, which it was Atterbury's object to confound as much as possible. The latter wished to make Convocation altogether parliamentary in its origin, that he might make it so also in its practice; but Kennet takes a counter view, and shows that it is in its nature as well as its formation, an assembly combining two distinct principles. His theory is, that the Convocation which we now have arose from an amalgamation of the old Parliamentary Convocation, which was summoned by the Crown in both the Archbishops' writs and the Bishops,' and which was chiefly convoked by the King for the purpose of raising subsidies from the Clergy, and of the pure Ecclesiastical Synod which met by inherent Church authority at the mandate of the Archbishop, and was to be engaged in framing canons and regulating the spiritual affairs of the Church. He considered the present Convocation in either of these lights according to the nature of the business before it. He doubted whether the Convocation could be considered as a Synod until it had received the Royal licence for entering upon ecclesiastical business; and he maintained that as far as it is a Synod it could not be regarded as a necessary part of our constitution; but only as it was a Parliamentary Convocation called in obedience to both the Bishops' and the Archbishops' writs.

We may sum up our criticism on Kennet by saying that his principles upon the whole are fairly stated, though his tone of writing[1] is most virulent. He followed up the subject in an 'Occasional Letter;'[2] but he gained no popularity by his work, in which he was generally considered to have betrayed the cause of the Clergy, and to have become an Iscariot to his order.

A pamphlet[3] written against Atterbury, and pointing out some of his, perhaps, wilful errors, with both clearness and force, was followed by some very clever 'Remarks on the Temper of the Writers about Convocations'[4] by Dr. Smalridge, which professed to be written by a country squire, and quizzed Wake

[1] Atterbury says,—'It is full of scurrility and bitter railing. When your Lordship (Trelawney) sees it you will find it the most consummate piece of impudence that has appeared in the world for many years. But being impudence on the right side, it will be not only accepted but applauded. It is near four hundred pages, and is but one part of several that are to follow.'—*Atterbury's Correspondence*, vol. i. p. 74.

[2] 'An Occasional Letter on the subject of English Convocations, by the author of Ecclesiastical Synods and Parliamentary Convocations.' 8vo. 1701.

[3] 'Mr. Atterbury's Arguments for the Rights, Powers, and Privileges of an English Convocation considered.' 4to. 1701.

'The principles of Mr. Atterbury's book,' by Dr. R. West, Chaplain to Bp. Burnet.

[4] 'Some Remarks on the Temper of the late Writers about Convocations, particularly Dr. Wake, Dr. Kennet, and the author of Mr. A.'s principles.' 4to. 1701.

and Kennet, and especially the latter, with a great deal of genial good-humour. There is not much in it, but it is really refreshing to the parched reader, like an oasis in the dry and ugly desert of the controversy.

The publications which have so far come before us, treat of Convocation, so to speak, *ab extra;* they discuss the theory of it, the origin of its two houses, and its *status* in our constitution; and as they were the first in order of time, so they may be arranged as one separate series among the works of our Convocational authors. But in order that we may take in the whole group of these writers at a glance, it will be necessary to add to our list one or two more works, which appeared at a later period in the controversy. These are Hody's 'History of English Councils and Convocations,' and Wake's 'State of the Church and the Clergy of England.' Nicolson,[1] also defended himself against Atterbury with perhaps more warmth than discretion. The 'Synodus Anglicana,' which at first sight seems as if it ought to be included in this class, really belongs to the second stage, when the controversy was chiefly practical, and related to the internal structure of Convocation, and the separate powers, and the mutual relations of the two houses between themselves.

Hody's book was published in 1701. He writes calmly, like a man who weighed his statements well before he committed them to the world, because he knew that they would not escape without a thorough examination. He is correct in his facts, and seldom ventures to theorize beyond them. He recapitulates a good deal of Kennet's matter, and in a great degree adopts his view of the origin and development of Convocation. His 'History of English Councils' is useful, though it is unattractive.

We cannot suppose that Wake, though his 'Authority of Christian Princes'[2] had been defended against Hill, with his consciousness of learning, and his unflagging industry, could rest silent after the provocation he had received from Atterbury. That prodigious mountain of information which he, together with Nicolson, Gibson, and Tanner, had been amassing, was for three years in labour, but then it brought forth another mountain worthy of its parent. A folio of 520 pages, with an appendix of 250 more, was the gigantic missile which he hurled, like one of Milton's angry angels, at the devoted head of his arch-adversary Atterbury. 'The State of the Church

[1] 'A Letter to the Rev. White Kennet, D.D. in defence of the English Historical Library against the unmannerly and slanderous objections of Mr. F. Atterbury, in his new theory of Convocation.' By W. Nicolson, Archdeacon of Carlisle. 1702.

[2] 'A Vindication of the Authority of Christian Princes from the Exceptions made against it by Mr. Hill,' &c. 1701.

and the Clergy of England in their Councils, Synods, Convocations, and Conventions' first saw the light in 1703. In it he exhausted the question. For those who have read it, it is conclusive in every sense of the word. He examines every statement of Atterbury's, he refutes each of his assertions, he corrects his minutest errors with triumphant self-gratulation, he cuts off all chance of retreat, and renders an answer almost a physical as well as a logical impossibility. For what mortal could write a reply to well nigh 800 folio pages?

Wake opens his tremendous battery, after vindicating his own principles, by dividing and distinguishing the various kinds of Ecclesiastical assemblies. He reckons them as four in number, and he gives a full account and history of each. I. The Parliamentary Conventions, which consisted of the Proctors who were returned in obedience to the *Præmunientes* writ, and were strictly members of the House of Commons; this assembly invariably sat at the same time with the Parliament. II. The Provincial Convocations, which were summoned by the Archbishop, and usually for the purpose of obtaining subsidies from the Clergy on that account. These often, though not necessarily, met concurrently with the Parliament; though on this point Wake expresses himself confusedly. III. The Diocesan Synods; and IV. The Provincial Councils, which had no connexion at all with the Parliament, and consisted only of the Episcopal Order; these last he considers to be the true Church Synod. These different assemblies he traces out at the greatest length, from the times of the Saxon kings, in treating of which period Nicolson especially assisted him, through the reigns of every English Sovereign down to his own King William III.; leaving, as we may well believe, no one authority uncited, no one precedent unmentioned: and yet when the student 'with difficulty and labour hard' has struggled through the enormous tome, and that perhaps, not once only, he finds to his disappointment that he has obtained no clear and comprehensive view of the subject; the facts are too numerous for any induction to grasp them, and the author himself is embarrassed by the very stores he has accumulated. The critical remark is a just one,—'That if the truth be with Wake, yet the appearance of it is with Atterbury.'

He draws, it is true, the distinctions between these several Assemblies pointedly and sharply; but they were not so clearly defined in reality. An assembly of the clergy, however brought together, we know by history, very often acted in several capa-

Wake says that the nature of the assembly changed in
lance with the business it was engaged upon. It might
been so; but we have often only his *à priori* ideas of
stency to ground the supposition upon. The fact, we

believe, was, that the Clergy of those days were extremely unwilling to meet from various reasons, of which economy is a likely one, and there was considerable difficulty in bringing them together; but that when they were once got to meet, whether by the King, the Archbishop, or the Papal Legate, the plan was to get as much work out of them—and as much money too—as could conveniently be secured in any shape whatever. Again, we imagine, that the Archbishop, or the King, on account of this aversion of the clergy to the trouble and expense of meeting, often as a matter of convenience only summoned those whose presence was indispensable to the business they had in hand.

The Clergy at that time did not claim attendance at these Assemblies as a right, but rather deprecated it as a burden, or resisted it as an exertion of unjustifiable power. And, therefore, even the very facts, which are so necessary to a constitutional argument, stubbornly refuse to run evenly together, and to submit quietly to the harness of a self-consistent theory. It was with Convocation as with Parliament: and the readers of Sir Francis Palgrave need to be reminded of the unwillingness of burgesses to elect and the ancient freeholders to be sent as representatives to Parliament.

We may be accused in these strictures of not having properly mastered the argument of Wake's folio; and perhaps we have not. But all we shall attempt to do in our own defence is, to bid those who think we have not done it justice, to read it for themselves. So far the particulars of the controversy have seemed no doubt to the reader dry enough; yet it is not utterly without its more amusing points.

These doughty combatants were not altogether wanting in a certain style of wit. Their jocularity indeed could scarcely be characterised as 'Attic salt;' it was more like that water which the beleaguered Spartans dug for on the shore of Sphacteria, and offered to each other to drink rile and bitter, *οἷον εἰκός*. But as the idea of *Facetiæ Synodicæ*, or Convocational 'Ana,' may perhaps be quite a new one to our readers, we may as well call a halt here, and cull some which seem readiest to hand. Atterbury shall come first:—

'Those little shifting equivocal forms of speech he is so full of, those savings and softenings he throws in everywhere, show that the thistles he was mumbling did not pass easily; and that he had not only no assurance that he was in the right, but a shrewd guess that he was in the wrong; and laid in matter therefore for evasion against he should have need of it.' —*Preface to the Rights*, p. xii.

Again,—

'Had I wished him ill, yet I would never have taken this way of expressing it: for Petavius has taught me long ago, that to write against

some men is the way only to have their pensions doubled. And the experience of later times than his has showed, that it is possible to write a man out of reputation into preferment. Much less can I be suspected to have engaged in this design out of interest. The way to that is not by appearing in behalf of Councils, which, as Johannes Major well observed, meet but seldom, and have no dignities to dispose of.'—*Preface to Rights*, p. xxiii.

'He produces two or three stories which I have shown to be utterly wide of the mark; and then concludes: "So entirely has the assembling of these Provincial Synods been looked upon to depend on the will and authority of the Christian Prince!" A conclusion that has no premises, nor any one clear and full instance in all his long bead-roll of Councils to support it.'

'The Doctor had kindly prepared us in his preface to expect digressions; but withal promised in his nice manner that they should be "rather not directly to the purpose than altogether distant from it." However, I find not that he has kept his word with us, or that they deserve to be thus gently dwelt with. In the first of them that meets me here, I have shown nine parts in ten of it, *i. e.* whatever he has said about general Councils, to be altogether distant from the purpose; and that other poor scantling about Provincial Synods, which seems to be, yet is really not to the purpose; and I conclude, therefore, that the whole is not only, not directly to the purpose, but altogether distant from it. The Doctor must forgive me, if I tell him that these historical unedifying accounts of his put me in mind of the honest confession of William Caxton, the chronicler, the words of which well became Dr. Wake's mouth as well every whit as they did his; and I cannot help thinking that I hear him at the close of his first chapter thus addressing himself to his reader:—

'"If I cowde," says he, "have founde moo storyes, I wolde have sette in it moo; but the substaunce that I can fynde and knowe I have shortly sette theyn in this boke; prayeigne all theym that see this symple werke of myne to pardone me of my symple writynge."

'And, indeed, I, for my part, should have been very ready to do so, had it been as harmless as it is simple; and were it not likely, as simple as it is, to be produced hereafter for a testimony against the Church's Rights, if it be not now opposed and disowned. For which reason, how simple soever the performance is, it deserves to be examined.'—*Atterbury's Rights, &c.*, pp. 152, 153.

After attacking the 'Letter to a Member of Parliament'—

'Dr. Wake, I remember, has an axiom "that logic is one thing and law another," which by-the-bye is all that he knows of either; and I must needs say, that I never in my life met with a better instance of the truth of that axiom than in this gentleman's law reasonings.'—*Rights*, p. 259.

He again has a hit at Wake—

'He has seen a journal, it seems, where there are no memorandums of anything done, and from that rough journal one would think that he had learnt all his skill in the business of Convocations. But had not something else been as empty as that journal, he would sure have foreborne giving this as an instance how Convocations have been employed.'—*Rights*, p. 288.

The gravity with which Wake receives this is something inimitable:—

'Whatever Dr. A. thinks of Dr. W. or his skill, yet for some of his ends' sake I would not have him speak too contemptibly of that empty urnal. It was Mr. Munday's journal of the proceedings of the Lower ouse which I referred to. . . . . "But had not something else," (he means

Dr. Wake's head,) "been as empty as that journal," . . . I accept his compliment; and only beg leave to inform him, that in quoting of this Convocation in the last place, I quoted the last Convocation that was granted as a subsidy to the King.'—*The State of the Church*, p. 525.

A little farther on—

'The Doctor pities poor Godolphin for depending on Sir E. Coke, in a matter of antiquity; the letter-writer brings this very Godolphin to confirm Sir E. Coke's opinion in a point of law; so little are they agreed upon the character and credit of their witnesses! Poor as he is, Doctor Wake, it seems, has a friend yet poorer than he, who would not else have vouchsafed to borrow from him. But why poor Godolphin? He was as rich in learning as his little gleanings could make him, a collector, and a scribbler: and how then comes Dr. Wake to despise him? Methinks we second-hand writers should learn to speak more respectfully of one another; because, if we ourselves do not, it is probable nobody else will.'—*Rights*, p. 456.

Burnet, too, comes in for some rather clever satire—first on his country,—

'The liberty Dr. Wake has taken in his censures, is, considering his present rank in the Church, a little too early; nor will the pattern he follows in it justify him. My Lord of Sarum, indeed, may freely have taxed the vices of the Clergy, even in books where he was defending the Orders of the Church of England, or the truth of the Christian Religion. His high station is his warrant for whatever he has done of this kind lately, and a bar to all manner of reply. And his former reprehensions, should they have been somewhat too free, are capable of this excuse, that being a stranger, he might not then have thoroughly acquainted himself with the state of our Church or the characters of its members; and if he saw faults in them it was not to be expected that he should conceal them with the same tenderness, as if he had had his birth and education among them.' —*Atterbury's Preface*, p. xvii.

Again, William III. suffers, and Burnet with him:—

'William the Conqueror is another of the pious patterns he recommends, who would suffer nothing, he says, to be determined in any Ecclesiastical causes, without leave and authority from him. . . . . His present Majesty is not William the Conqueror, and can no more, by our Constitution, rule absolutely, either in Church or State, than he would, even if he could. His will and pleasure is indeed a law to all his subjects, not in a conquering sense, but because his will and pleasure is only that the laws of our country should be obeyed, which he came over on purpose to rescue, and counts it his great prerogative to maintain, and contemns therefore, I doubt not, such sordid flattery as would measure the extent of his supremacy from the Conqueror's claim.

'Intimations of this kind have been thought so heinous as to be purged only by fire, a punishment which our gentle laws, though they have taken it off from men, have still reserved for books, and applied it now and then to repress a state heresie, and secure the fundamentals of our Constitution against all its undermining.'—*Rights*, pp. 158—160.

In order to fully appreciate the allusion to purgation by fire in this extract, the reader must remember that Burnet's 'Pastoral Letter' had been condemned to be burnt by the common hangman in January 1693, by the order of the House of Commons, because the Bishop in it had based the title of William of Holland to the Crown of England upon the right of conquest.

This, not unnaturally, gave great offence to the English nation. However Burnet tries to take it with a smile:—

'He writes with just and due respect of the King, and of the present Constitution. This has come so seldom from that corner that it ought to be the more considered. I will not give that scope to jealousy as to suspect that this was an artifice, but accept its sincerity.'—*Reflections*, p. 4.

Kennet can hardly be called witty:—

'When Mr. A. has "thankfully accepted this hint from Mr. Selden, he desires thus to improve it." Indeed, a story at second-hand is seldom told without improvement. But then such improvements commonly deserve another name.'—*Ecclesiastical Synods*, p. 235.

But the following quiz by Smalridge upon his style and his dedication certainly is:—

'For what else can he mean by this dedication, which, when rightly explained, runs naturally in this form,—May it please your Grace, Mr. A. has lately forced a dedication upon you, which savours too much of presumption or design. He has presumed to surprise you with an unexpected address, and appears very indecently before your Grace, because he has taken no care to express upon this subject a due respect and reverence to the Governors in Church and State, such as is suitable to the Christian religion, and his particular function. The reports and authorities in his books are the fruits of other men's collections, not the immediate effects of his own searches into registers and records. He imperiously summons your Grace, and my Lords the Bishops, to an immediate compliance, upon pain of being pronounced the betrayers of the Church. This, my Lord, is the character of the person I set up against. But as for me, I am quite another sort of man, I am very well bred, a great antiquary, beholding to nobody; "some wits and merry folks call me a tool and a plaything." (Pref. 8.) But I assure your Grace, that what freedom soever I may have taken in showing the vices of the inferior Clergy, (Pp. 77, 188) and "in reflecting upon the ambitious designs of dignified Presbyters" (196); yet "I am, however, tender and dutiful in treating the Governors of our Church." (78.) Especially "those of them who are of the Ecclesiastical commission for preferments." (311.) I have a very great respect and reverence for every body that will give me anything; and how resolute soever Mr. A. may be, your Grace may do what you please, with

'Your Grace's most humble and obedient Servant,

'WHITE KENNET.'

'One who observes how many good words this author has here bestowed upon himself, and how few upon his Patrons, would be tempted to think that the Archbishop was here dedicating to Dr. Kennet, and not the Doctor to his Grace. Long panegyrics upon a man's self are always nauseous; but they are somewhat more unpardonable in this author, who, to show his judgment, has chosen so scurvy a subject to commend, when he had so eminent a one before him, upon which he might in justice, and ought in decency to have enlarged. He might, perhaps be encouraged to use this method by Dr. Wake's example, but he should have remembered the Fable, and have considered that the same freedoms are not alike proper to be taken by all creatures.'—*Remarks on the Temper of Writers on Convocation.*

The Convocation[1] had met on February 10th, 1701, for some

[1] 'A true and exact list of the members of both Houses of this present Convocation summoned to meet the 6th Feb. 1700, in the Chapter House of S. Paul's,' published March 4, 1701

few sessions; and the dispute between the Bishops and the Inferior Clergy became a prominent topic, and was the occasion of much writing and printing. The privileges of the two Houses, the forms of their intercourse, and the nature of their mutual relations were themes upon which indefatigable antiquaries and excited controversialists might argue to any conceivable extent. Directly a paper on the side of the Upper House came out, it was replied to by a defender of the rights of the Lower, and this in turn was answered by some eager advocate of the opposite cause. One pamphlet produced another, and this again a third; so that the history of this part of our Convocation Literature—which seems to fall naturally enough into a series or group of its own—will read something like a literary genealogy,

ὥσπερ εἰ λέγοις,
Ἱππόνικος Καλλίου, κἀξ Ἱππόνικου Καλλίας.

Atterbury, who had published a second and corrected edition of his 'Rights, Powers, and Privileges,' with his name, just before the Convocation met, and to whom the Clergy might justly be considered indebted for its meeting at all, as might be expected, took a leading part in all this. His object at first was to maintain, in accordance with the theory of his book, that those proctors only who had been returned upon the *Præmunientes* clause,[1] as some had been, were properly members of Convocation. But the principle which his party were most desirous of establishing was, that the Lower House were 'the Spiritual Commons of the Realm,' and that their rights and forms of proceeding were to be modelled upon those of the Temporal Commons. In order to bring the question to an issue, and to vindicate their own right to do business independently of the Upper House, they proceeded to hold separate sessions of their own, after they had been prorogued by the Archbishop's schedule on the 25th February: at the same time they claimed to be prorogued only by their own Prolocutor, and not by the President.

The Sessions of the whole Convocation were but few; and a complaint respecting Toland's 'Christianity not Mysterious,' and a representation against Burnet's 'Exposition of the thirty-nine Articles,' were the only noticeable transactions.

A new writer now appeared in the controversy. Edmund Gibson, chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and not at that time a member of the Convocation, undertook to refute the claims of the Lower House. His 'Letter to a friend in the country

[1] Bishop Sprat writes to Bishop Trelawney, Jan. 14, 1701:—'My Lord of London and I have summoned our Clergy by our parliament writ, according to the clause *Præmunientes*, as well as by the Convocation writ: we doubt not but your Lordship will do the like.'—*Atterbury's Correspondence*, vol. i. p. 63.

Before the expiration of the year, a new Convocation was to be called together, and the election of the members excited no small attention.[1] An attempt was again made to get the Parliament writ more generally executed, and thus to give the Convocation a more thoroughly parliamentary character. In 'The Case of the Præmunientes considered' Dr. Kennet entered into the history, and argued the question of the writs with considerable clearness, and did much towards setting it at rest, by proving that, whatever might be the power of the *Præmunientes* writ, and the intention of the Constitution in retaining it, the Proctors of the Clergy, and the other members of the Convocation, were, and always had been, returned in obedience to the mandate of the Archbishop, and in accordance with the Royal writ which had been directed to him. The Lower House, however, did altogether relinquish their claim to be summoned by the Parliament writ in conjunction at least with the other.

Before the Convocation met an attempt was made at a compromise, on terms which seemed then no doubt more advantageous to the Upper House than they do now. 'An Expedient proposed,'[2] was written by Binckes, partly in reply to Gibson's argument in 'The Right of the Archbishop,' and partly with a view to marking out some principles on which mutual concessions

[1] The following are the pamphlets on this question, of which the first two and sixth are by Atterbury, and the fourth, fifth and last by Dr. Trimnell:—

'A Letter to a Clergyman in the country, concerning the choice of members and the execution of the Parliament Writ for the ensuing Convocation.' Nov. 17, 1701.

'A second Letter to a Clergyman in the country about the execution of the Parliament Writ for the ensuing Convocation.' Dec. 10, 1701.

'The Case of the Præmunientes considered, in answer to the Letter concerning the choice of members and the execution of the Parliament Writ for the ensuing Convocation.' 1701.

'The late Pretence of a Constant Practice to enter the Parliament as well as the Provincial Writ in the front of the Acts of every Synod, considered in a Letter to the author of the Assertion.' Dec. 11, 1701.

'The late Pretence of a Constant Practice, &c. further considered and disproved in a second Letter.' Dec. 16, 1701.

'A third Letter to a Clergyman in the country, &c. in defence of the two former.' Jan. 8, 1702.

'An Answer to a third Letter to a Clergyman in the country, &c.' March 6, 1702.

Other publications, chiefly by Atterbury, were these—

'A Letter to a Clergy-Man in the city, concerning the Instructions given to the Proctors for the Diocese of Worcester.' 4to. Jan. 26, 1702.

'A faithful Account of some Transactions in the three last Sessions of the present Convocation.' 4to. Feb. 14th, 1701. Numb. 1.

'A faithful Account of what passed in Convocation.' 4to. Feb. 19. Numb. 2.

'A true Copy of the Arch-Bishop's Speech in Jerusalem Chamber, on Thursday, Feb. 19, 1701.' 4to. 1701.

'A Continuation of the faithful Account of what passed in Convocation. 4to. March 7, 1702. Numb. 3.

[2] 'An Expedient proposed, or the occasions of the late Controversy in Convocation considered, and a method of adjournment pointed out consistent with the claims of both Houses, in a Letter to the author of a late book, intituled, The Right of the Archbishop, by a Country Divine.' Dec. 30, 1701.

might perhaps be arranged between the two Houses. He thus states the grounds of the dispute, and the complaints of the Lower Clergy:—

'And now you have a full view of the true causes and occasions of the late controversy in Convocation, which, though they may have branched themselves into several particulars, yet they all sprang from the same root, and are, owing to the suspicion and jealousy, which the inferior Clergy have laboured under, for some years together, that their constitution, as to Convocations, is at stake; and this they impute to the contrivance of some persons, who do not mean well to the Established Church, and are afraid a Convocation would not only discover, but expose their designs.

'From what has been said, it very evidently appears that the occasions of the present controversy are chiefly these.—I. Such an unusual discontinuance of Convocational Meetings, though the Clergy have been called by the Royal Writ, as is not to be met with throughout the course of many ages; there being scarce any precedent, except in the extraordinary case of the Oxford Parliament in 1681, of a Prolocutor not being chosen. II. The unprecedented method of adjourning which the Upper House thought fit to begin the first Session with, by sending a commissary to adjourn the Lower House in the presence of the Prolocutor, and this, seconded by the Registrar being sent soon after to do the like. This way of adjourning is never to be met with throughout the books, and was taken up by an accidental mistake very lately. III. The two motions sent by the Upper House to the Lower concerning their putting a stop to all business upon the receipt of a schedule from the Archbishop, and requiring their attendance at the Jerusalem Chamber, before they met in their House, very plainly appeared to be a ready way to make all meetings and consultations of the Lower House to be precarious, and to depend entirely upon the pleasure of the Archbishop. IV. That which made it right for the Lower House to assert a right of meeting upon intermediate days—for the which they have precedents—was an adjournment of a month; which, while the Parliament sits and is neither adjourned nor prorogued, is without precedent, the adjournments upon the books very rarely exceeding a week or ten days, unless by Royal Writ.'—P. 15.

Binckes then proceeds to make seven propositions for adjusting these differences, and setting the question at rest. The most important of these were—II. That the Lower House should have a place of meeting of their own. III. That a committee of both Houses should be appointed to decide the matter in debate, and that in the meantime the Lower House shall always meet on the days on which the Bishops sit. V. That adjournments should generally be not for more than a week. VI. That the schedule shall adjourn the Lower House, but not so as to break short or interrupt the business they are engaged upon. 'The Expedient,'[1] met with considerable opposition, and had no effect beyond making an addition to the contro-

[1] 'History of the Convocation which met, Feb. 6, 1700.' 4to. 1702.
'The Narrative of the Lower House vindicated from the exceptions of a Letter intituled, The Right of the Archbishop to continue or prorogue the whole Convocation.' 4to. 1702.
'Vindication of the Narrative continued.' 1702. These two are by Hooper.

versy. Gibson replied to it immediately in 'Reflections upon an Expedient proposed,' having previously published 'A Vindication of the Rights of the Archbishop.' In the meantime Kennet and the Upper House party published 'The History of the Convocation of Feb. 6, 1701,' which was drawn from the acts of both Houses, and was intended to counteract 'The Narrative' of the Lower House; and Kennet, in 'A Reconciling Letter,' exposed the contradictions into which the partisans of the Lower House had fallen, and particularly the discrepancies which existed between the first and second edition of Atterbury's 'Rights and Powers:' but the strength of the Bishops' party did not lie in their wit. Several[1] other pamphlets by Kennet and Gibson accused the Lower House of a tendency to Presbyterianism, a charge from which they could defend themselves without much difficulty, although it was from time to time reiterated by their opponents. Binckes says—

'But when they are known to be the most zealous assertors of Episcopacy, and several of them by their former attendances on Archbishops and Bishops, have been bred up to a veneration of the Order, and are the *jure divino* men, the "High Church men," as some call them, that is, they are for opposing all such as are for bringing an Episcopal Church upon the level with other constitutions, though they are upbraided with their "magisterial stiffness," and told the times will not bear it; to accuse such men of encouraging the enemies of Episcopacy, is a contradiction *in terminis;* and one may as well say that a Bishop is an enemy to his own order, and leans to Presbytery.'—*The Expedient*, p. 18.

The Lower House at this time made an endeavour to have their differences settled by presenting a petition to the Queen, that she would cause the question to be examined, which they laid before her December 23, 1702: but no answer was returned to them, except that the Queen 'would consider of their petition,' and they were obliged to return to the old literary warfare.

'The Pretended Expedient, in a Letter to the author, showing that title to be contrary to the book, especially with relation to the right of an Episcopal Church.' 4to. 1702. By Dr. Sherlock.

'Reflections upon a late Paper, intituled, An Expedient proposed, showing the unreasonableness thereof, &c.' 1702.

'A reconciling Letter upon the late Differences about Convocational Rights and Proceedings.' 1702.

[1] The two first of these are by Kennet, the next by Gibson, and the last by Sherlock.

'A Letter from a Scotch Presbyterian, touching the English Convocation.' June 30, 1702.

'A Letter from the borders of Scotland, concerning somewhat of agreement between a Scotch general assembly and an English provincial Convocation, by an Episcopal Divine.' Sept. 21, 1702.

'The Parallel continued between a Presbyterian assembly and the new model of an English provincial Synod.' Dec. 9, 1702.

'The new danger of Presbytery, or the claims of some in the Lower House of Convocation very dangerous to the institution of an Episcopal and Metropolitical Church.' 1703.

'The Case of the Schedule stated' was Atterbury's next pamphlet. Atterbury was endowed in perfection with the happy art of putting his opponent out of temper, and even the well-regulated placidity of Gibson at length yielded to its influence. 'The Schedule Reviewed,' in which he took off the arguments of Atterbury and defended those which he had himself advanced, betrays, amid the profusion of information which it exhibits, the marks of a temper which was beginning to be sorely tried. But the great publication of this year was Gibson's 'Synodus Anglicana,' a treatise on Convocation which was perhaps designed to supply the place of the authoritative 'Modus tenendi Convocationem,' the preparation of which had been more than once suggested. It was accompanied by a reprint of all the remaining Journals and Minutes of Convocation. Written upon a theory which was not a correct one, and intended to occupy a place in the controversy which was going on, it is, notwithstanding, distinguished by so large an amount of thoughtful reading, such careful induction, and such a spirit of candour, as to be beyond doubt the work of most real and intrinsic value which the dispute on Convocation called into existence. Dr. Cardwell has reproduced it for the readers of the present day: and it says much for Gibson's arrangement of his matter and treatment of his subject, that an Editor of Dr. Cardwell's experience and erudition, has thought it unnecessary to add much, either of illustration or comment, to the original text. A brief historic preface, written with philosophic calmness and a tendency to liberalism, is sufficient to introduce Gibson's 'Synodus Anglicana' to the Convocation student in the edition of 1854.

Gibson's view was, as we have stated, that the Upper House was the embodiment of the Episcopate, and the Lower of the Presbyterate; and, that the Catholic principle, 'The Bishops are the Synod,' was the leading idea of the Convocation of the English Church. This view was inconsistent with the facts, which the opponents of Gibson appear not to have remembered, that the Upper House originally comprehended the Abbots and Priors, who greatly outnumbered the baronial Bishops; and that many of these latter sat in the Lower House by virtue of their *commendams*, while the inferior or non-baronial suffragan Bishops did so universally. The principles, and even the form of our Church Synods, it is allowed by Gibson himself, were not materially altered at the Reformation; and therefore, as the distinction between the Upper and Lower Houses was not originally coincident with that between the Episcopate and Presbyterate, it seems to us that, to use the language of the schools, *cadit quæstio*. On this principle, however, the 'Synodus Anglicana' takes *seriatim* the different parts of the Convocation

and their relations to each other—The summoning, The opening, The duties of the Prolocutor, The manner of entering upon business, The rights of the President and Bishops, Those of the inferior Clergy, and the manner of passing business: and the whole of these subjects are treated in so lucid a way, and are illustrated so fully from the practice of those of our former Convocations, whose records are extant, that the 'Synodus Anglicana,' while any vestiges of the ancient Synodal rights of the Church of England are left, must not only be had recourse to, but studied diligently, by those who would ascertain what those rights are.

Shortly after the 'Synodus Anglicana,' Gibson published 'A short state of some present questions in Convocation,' answered by Hooper, in 'A summary defence of the Lower House:'[1] and then Atterbury and Gibson were again matched as combatants. The former brought out 'The Parliamentary Original and Rights of the Lower House,' to which the latter, in 1703, rejoined in 'The pretended Independency of the Lower House upon the Upper,' and vindicated the 'Synodus Anglicana' and 'The Schedule Reviewed,' from the censures of Atterbury. These pamphlets are peculiarly valuable from the precedents which they produce, and the light which they throw upon the relations of the Houses; but the statements of each party require to be checked by those of the other side. Soon after, Gibson, for he was possessed of a perseverance even more indomitable than Atterbury's energy, chanted his own song of victory over the Lower House, and especially over Hooper, in 'The Marks of a defenceless Cause.' Wake's larger work, which we have already noticed, now appeared, and seems rather to have crushed the smaller publications out of existence, for no more works of any peculiar merit come before us during the sitting of this Convocation, which ended in 1705. 'An account of the Proceedings' between the two Houses of Convocation by Dr. Trimnell, afterwards Bishop of Winchester, and 'The Complainer reproved,' and 'The Complainer further reproved,' by Gibson, are the only pamphlets of consequence; though 'A Collection of Papers' contains many documents of value to a Convocation student.

The next Convocation met October 25th, 1705; and Binckes was elected Prolocutor. The practice of intermediate sessions was revived, and the custom of the Irish Convocation was cited

[1] The following are some minor pamphlets:—
'A Letter from a Clergyman in Ireland, to a Convocation man in England.' Aug. 9, 1703.
'A Representation made by the Lower House of Convocation to the Archbishops and Bishops.' Dec. 1704.
'The Bishop of Sarum's Charge at his triennial Visitation.' 1704.

as a precedent. But the conduct of the Lower House during this Convocation drew down upon themselves a sharp rebuke from the Government, in which the Queen 'declared her resolu-'tion to maintain her supremacy, and the due subordination of 'Presbyters to Bishops, as fundamental parts of the constitution 'of the Church of England.' This advantage the Upper House of course made the most of. 'Some Proceedings in the Convocation A.D. 1705, faithfully represented,' the preface to which was written by Atterbury, and replied to by Trimnell, in 'Partiality detected,' is the only pamphlet[1] upon which we need dwell. In it he reflects with much severity, and with some justice, upon the conduct of the Bishops in always ignoring the requests and the proposals, which the Lower House made to them for reforming the abuses and furthering the interests of the Church.

'The coldness and neglect, with which all these requests were received, was very amazing. Of some of them no manner of notice was taken: upon others, the Bishops contented themselves to make observations in writing, without imparting them to the Clergy, and without entering them in their books, where recourse might be had to them: or, perhaps, the Archbishops, at the close of the Convocation, made a speech to the Lower House, and said in it somewhat concerning the several proposals that had been made by them, and there the matter rested, without any further effect.

'When business of high consequence to the Church, and such as was likely to do honour to the promoters of it, was started by the Clergy, attempts of the same kind, without doors, were set forward, which might supersede theirs. Thus, when the Committee I have mentioned was appointed, March 17, 1701, to consider what might be done towards "Propagating the Christian religion, as professed in the Church of England, in our Foreign Plantations," and that committee, (composed of very venerable and experienced men, well suited to such an inquiry) had sat several times at S. Paul's, and made some progress in the business referred to them; a charter was presently procured to place the consideration of that matter in other hands, where it now remains, and will, we hope, produce excellent fruits. But whatever they are, they must be acknowledged to have sprung from the overtures to that purpose first made by the Lower House of Convocation.

'While all motions from the Lower Houses, which tended towards business, were thus checked and repressed, no offers of the same kind were ever made by the Upper; nor anything in eight years proposed from them, besides an address, now and then, with some discriminating clause, which might turn to the reproach of the Clergy, if they complied with it, and render them obnoxious, if they refuted it. We know who said—"If a son shall ask bread of any of you that is a father, will he give him a stone? or if he ask fish, will he for a fish give him a serpent? or if he shall ask an egg, will he give him a scorpion?" The reverence I bear towards our spiritual Fathers, inclines me rather to leave the application of these words to the reader, than to make it myself.'—Pp. 10, 11 *of Preface.*

[1] Atterbury was also attacked with some humour and much coarseness in 'A Layman's Letter to a great Divine Dr. A. B. C. D.'

The Government at this time seems to have set itself in earnest against the Convocation, which was allowed to do nothing until it was dissolved with the Parliament.

In 1708 a Convocation was summoned, but it was not allowed to meet, and no further transactions are to be recorded until 1710. Atterbury was then chosen Prolocutor in opposition to Kennet, and the business of the Church was proceeded with, with some degree of earnestness. 'A Representation of the present state of Religion,' in which the progress of vice and unbelief in the nation was depicted in very strong and perhaps heightened colours, was drawn up and passed by the Lower House, but was rejected by the Upper, who transmitted to them a softened picture in 'A Representation' of their own.[1] The publications on the controversy which had lasted so long had now dwindled in number.[2] 'Presbyters are not always an authoritative part of Provincial Synods,' appeared in 1710, and 'The Mitre and the Crown, or a real distinction between them,' and 'A continuation of the Mitre and the Crown,' were published in 1712, and have been generally considered as Atterbury's, although they advocate the independence and rights of the Church and the Convocation with much moderation of tone and language.[3] The pamphlets occasioned by Dr. Clarke's controversy as a class by themselves. The Hoadley controversy was soon about to absorb all the attention and the activity of those to whom controversy had become almost a necessary of existence; and was to be more bitter, more wearisome, and more injurious in its effects to the Church, than the dispute we have just gone through. We hurry by it, as we would hurry by a crowded grave-yard after nightfall. No licence since then has been issued to the Convocation; and therefore from the year 1717 its sessions have had no practical result. In 1728,[4] however, some advances were made towards a reconciliation; and in 1742 the Lower House finally submitted, and it was thought[5] that they would have proceeded to business:

[1] Atterbury writes, March 15, 1701. 'We appointed another Committee, for considering the methods of '*Propagating the Christian Religion in Foreign Parts*,' who sat the first time this afternoon in the Chapter House of S. Paul's.'—*Atterbury's Correspondence*, vol. i. p. 88.

[2] 'The Representation Examined' and 'The question of the present Convocation considered in answer to the examiner's unfair representations,' 1711, may be added.

[3] 'The Wisdom of Looking Backward,' by Kennet, is a useful work written in defence of the Upper House.

[4] 'The Humble Address of the Convocation to the King, Feb. 14, 1728, with His Majesty's Answer,' 1728, and also, 'The Address of the Clergy in Convocation to the King, Feb. 14, 1735, with His Majesty's Answer,' 1735.

[5] It is worth noting that the last motion ever brought before Convocation, which on Jan. 27th, 1742, was ordered to be 'reduced into writing, and the particulars offered to the House at their next assembly,' was this—

'VII. That much reproach is brought upon the beneficed, and much oppression

but either the Bishops or the Government were afraid of the consequences. Since that time, until within the last few years, the Synodical rights[1] of the Church of England have been invariably sacrificed either to timid indecision on the one side, or to unconstitutional oppression on the other.

Now let us turn back, and take a review of the long and sterile tract of polemic literature which we have traversed. How utterly profitless it looks! After all the toil, the research, the learning, the industry, the genius, the contention, that had been wasted on it, there were no results whatever; no apparent results at least for good, though there were results for evil.

Before it began the Convocation had been silent for more than ten years; but before its close it was condemned to a silence of more than a century. The disputings of those angry partisans have become, unfairly enough, a standing argument of some speciousness against the revival of its powers; while a more forcible, because a truer one, lies in its inactivity for all Church purposes, of which their litigiousness was the cause. We have traced out the features of the quarrel, and have in doing it used a tone of levity, which at first sight would appear wrong on a subject so nearly connected with what, as Christians, we must hold holy. But we have done this intentionally; for, we feel sure that in many instances—we will not in charity say in all—the disputants sought their own honour more than that of the Church. They[2] desired to bring themselves into notice, because notice led to preferment or to power: and the efficiency and development of the principles of the Church became too often in their eyes mere stepping-stones by which their own interests and those of their party might be carried higher.

---

upon the unbeneficed Clergy, by Curates accepting too scanty salaries from Incumbents.'

But the next sessions, March 5th, 1742, the Prolocutor, Dr. Lisle, was afraid to go on with any business, and so the subject dropped.

See 'A Letter to the Rev. Dr. Lisle, Prolocutor, by the Archdeacon of Lincoln.'

[1] 'A Letter to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, from a Member of Convocation,' 1742, is an indignant remonstrance against the suppression of Convocational Rights.

[2] Atterbury writes:—'If the Dean of Canterbury (Dr. Hooper) be made Bishop, (of S. Asaph) with a design to give him the chief hand in the administration of Ecclesiastical affairs, I, my Lord, am sure to be oppressed and kept under as much as if Archbishop Tillotson were alive and at the helm; for that I prepare myself, and God's will be done in it! However, let the Dean of Canterbury be as great as he will, I must take the liberty to tell him, that it was my poor labours that made him so. For had not the book I wrote procured a Convocation, and given him by that means an opportunity of forming a strong body of the Clergy, and placing himself at the head of them, he could not *have made it necessary for the Crown to take notice of him* in order to bring things to a temper; but would have continued Dean of Canterbury still. In return for this, I know, I am to be neglected and sacrificed, as far as he is able to bring it about.'—*Atterbury's Correspondence*, vol. i. p. 209.

They had their reward. They became Bishops, it is true:—almost every one of the names we have just been so often repeating is to be found in the roll of the English Episcopate. Yet it is a perilous thing to receive a bishopric as a reward, for any work however good. It is still more perilous to look forward to it as such. Wake, with his real religious feeling, and the perception which he had, however dim, of the value of Catholic unity, cannot but have repented himself, while he watched the slow decay of the Church's life under the influence of the Hanoverian dynasty. And the close of Atterbury's life, with its melancholy interest, is a subject, if ever there was one, with which

To point a moral, or adorn a tale.

Had these men, with their great intellectual power and their acquired talents, been really single in their motives, and employed only pure and righteous means to attain the end for which they strove so hard, we cannot believe that the Lord of the Church would have allowed them to have been made first the tools and next the laughing-stocks of Ministers of State,[1] who were infidels or schismatics. We do not judge them, for the times were difficult and evil; but facts do. The Church of England after their days fell into a state of spiritual poverty and wretchedness, only not worse than death:—a state in which the very religious truth and manliness of Wesley was by a sad necessity made the stumbling-block for his soul. *Post hoc, ergo, propter hoc,* is not always a fallacy.

We are upon the eve of another synodal movement. It has been long waited for, and prayed for; and it is now begun. The reform and revival of our ancient Church Assembly in Convocation, which once seemed to be beyond hope or even fancy, is now in hand. Our Church must take a lesson from the past. She must watch, and hope, and strive, that the movement of our days may not either in its history or its event resemble the movement of 1697—1742. That began in power and ended in weakness; it originated in the self-glory of man, and resulted in the dishonour of the Church; it was 'of the earth, earthy.' May this be in all points otherwise!

That it may be so, the restoration of her Synods to our own portion of the Church Catholic must be sought from a right motive and carried out in a right spirit. Honest uprightness

[1] 'A Private Letter that the Lord Bishop of S—— had reported in the House of Lords, that the Lord T——r had frequently boasted to his friends that he had bamboozled the Convocation; *i. e.* set them to work for amusement only, and a little to burn their own fingers.'—Kennet, in 1711, quoted in Lathbury's History of Convocation, 2d edition, p. 417.

ART. IV.—1. *Theologia Moralis S. Alphonsi de Ligorio, Fundatoris Congregationis SS. Redemptoris ac olim Episcopi S. Agathæ Gothorum.* Editio novissima; curavit P. MICH. HEILIG, Congr. SS. Redempt. Presbyter, et Professor Theol. Moralis. Parisiis, 1845.

2. *Homo Apostolicus, sive Praxis et Instructio Confessariorum. Auctore illustrissimo et reverendissimo D. Alphonso de Ligorio,* Editio nova. Moguntiæ, 1842.

3. *Compendium Theologiæ Moralis S. Alphonsi Mariæ de Ligorio, Auctore* D. NEYRAGUET, Presbytero Diœcesis Ruthenensis Missionario. Liburni, 1851.

4. *Cases of Conscience, or Lessons in Morals.* Sixth Edition. London, 1853.

THAT S. Alfonso Maria de' Liguori's *Theologia Moralis* is the latest exponent of Rome's moral system we have already made clear, in an article which appeared in our January number of the present year. We showed that he had been beatified and canonized so late as the year 1839, that the Sacred Congregation of Rites had examined his system of morality twenty times, and had agreed, 'with concordant voice, with unanimous consent, with one voice and with one mind,' that it contained nothing to be censured. We showed that an authoritative document issuing from the Sacred Penitentiary in 1831, decreed that the opinions professed in the Blessed Alfonso's Moral Theology might with safety be followed and professed, on the ground that the Holy Apostolic See had declared that it found nothing in his works worthy of censure; and that the Cardinal Archbishop of Besançon had required his clergy to adhere to the judgment of Rome by following and reducing to practice the opinions of the Blessed Alfonso de' Liguori, all doubt whatever being thrown aside. But it appears that the beatification, canonization, commendation, approbation, ratification, and sanction have not been sufficient to persuade some of our readers that all members of the Roman Church are really tied to accepting his morality. Indeed with respect to Englishmen who are members of the Roman Communion, we cannot wonder at a little kicking, and plunging, and tossing the yoke, when they find what they have to bear. We must, therefore, add more testimony, showing on unimpeachable authority that Rome is committed to S. Alfonso, and that his morality is her morality.

The preface to his Moral Theology opens as follows. 'The 'new edition of S. Alfonso de' Liguori's Moral Theology, which 'has been long looked for from the Mechlin press, is at last pub- 'lished. The work which is thus issued afresh after innumerable 'editions and no small labour, is not only the teaching of a very 'learned, experienced, and wise author, but of a Saint; and it is 'approved by the judgment of the Catholic Church itself. We 'hold, therefore, that it is a superfluous task to commend or 'defend it against those who find fault with it, since it has 'been commended and defended by the oracle of the Church 'itself.'

Again: 'We have issued a work in which, by the judgment 'of the Roman Church itself, there is found nothing, no 'opinion and no principle, which is deserving of censure; of 'this we are most perfectly assured by the decree concerning 'the revision of S. Alfonso's works. The teaching of Benedict 'XIV. about the canonization of Saints shows us what force 'the Apostolic approbation has, and what is the mind of the 'Church in approving of the writings of the servants of God 'with a view to their canonization. In our times all the writings 'of a servant of God, who is to be placed among the Blessed, 'must be subjected to an extremely rigid examination according 'to the decrees of Urban VIII., and the approved teaching of 'Benedict XIV. And the purpose of a judicial revision of this 'nature is that it may be seen whether the teaching of the 'servant of God be free from all theological censure. Now 'every proposition which is heretical, erroneous, approaching to 'error, savouring of heresy or error, suspected of error, rash, 'scandalous, offensive to pious ears, ill-sounding, misleading to 'the simple, schismatical, injurious, impious, or blasphemous, is 'subject to theological censure, several sorts of which Benedict 'himself recounts. The revisers are bound to note if there is 'in the works any error against faith or good morals, or any new 'doctrine unaccordant with the sense of the Church; meaning by 'new doctrine, not anything brought forward in a new way, but 'something put forth which is really new, vain, and useless, op- 'posed to Scripture and to the Fathers. It is the duty, there- 'fore, of the revisers to subject every single proposition to its 'own special censure, and to pass judgment on the quality of 'the propositions as they are in themselves, independently of the 'author's intention, so that it is impossible to proceed further 'when once they find that the servant of God has written any- 'thing against the faith, or good morals, or the sense of the 'Church, although he wrote it with a good intention. An exami- tion of this nature having been instituted with a view to e canonization of S. Alfonso de' Liguori, and the Church

'having declared that in his works there was found nothing 'worthy of censure, it follows that it is safe for any one to 'follow and profess the opinions which S. Alfonso professes in 'his Moral Theology, and that no man is to be troubled for 'doing so, although he may not have weighed the reasons on 'which the several opinions rest.'

The meaning of *nihil censurâ dignum* is then further explained to be a true approbation 'by which it is certain that the whole 'teaching of our saintly author is altogether free from every 'error which the Church now sees to be error. The works of 'S. Alfonso, therefore, rejoice in this highest and singular privi-'lege, which those of no uncanonized moral writers can possess, 'for in their case it is not made certain by so solemn a judgment 'of the Church, that there is no error, no erroneous principle, 'no erroneous opinion in their writings. But we are now 'made quite sure, by the infallible judgment of the Catholic 'Church, that in S. Alfonso's works, in the whole of his Moral 'Theology, there is not one principle disapproved, not one opinion 'against the faith or good morals, new, unaccordant with the 'sense of the Church, heretical, erroneous, approaching to error, 'savouring of heresy or error, suspected of error, rash, scan-'dalous, offensive to pious ears, ill-sounding, misleading to the 'simple, schismatical, injurious, impious, or blasphemous. And 'this being so, who will not confess that in the matter of morals, 'grave and difficult as it is, and so involved with doubts and 'questions, minds are wonderfully set at rest by an approbation 'of this nature, which if not called formally positive, is practi-'cally the same?'

Neyraguet is no less happy and confident. Having quoted the approbation of Pope Pius VII., Pope Leo XII., Pope Pius VIII., and Pope Gregory XVI., he continues: 'Thus by 'acting and by teaching, to heaven flew off the Blessed One. 'What can you prize higher? what happier lot can you wish 'for yourself? There is then no danger of erring, no possibility 'of fearing hell in following the steps of so great a man. It is 'no wonder, therefore, that in these times this Theology is 'everywhere desired and sought after; that it is extolled with 'the highest praises by prelates of Churches, and the chiefest 'doctors, not only in Italy, but also in Germany, Belgium, 'France, &c.; that it is circulated throughout the whole world, 'and is in the hands of almost all the clergy. What then can 'be more absurd than to find fault with a work of such singular 'excellence, which innumerable doctors and so many oracles of 'the Holy See have so highly commended!'

In the same way the Redemptorist Father who has translated S. Alfonso's *Glories of Mary*, stands over some reluctant friends

whom he mentally anticipates as recalcitrating at some of the tales which are recounted, like Queen Eleanor before Fair Rosamond, with his *nihil censurâ dignum* in one hand, and his book in the other, and tells them to take their choice between condemning the Holy See, and swallowing the miracles, having himself, with delightful inconsistency, omitted two of the stories as being totally impossible of digestion to an English stomach. 'Remember,' he says, 'that it has been strictly examined by 'the authority which is charged by God Himself to instruct you, 'and that that authority has declared that it contains NOTHING 'worthy of censure, and that it has been welcomed by all lovers 'of Jesus and Mary, throughout the world, with enthusiasm.'[1]

The Bull of Canonization was issued by the present Pope's predecessor, Gregory XVI., and in it we find the late Pontiff announcing as *imprimis notatu dignum, quod licet copiosissime 'scripserit, ejusdem tamen opera inoffenso prorsus pede percurri a 'fidelibus posse, post diligens institutum examen perspectum fuerit.'* If any ask, even yet, for evidence, the following passage from the Life of S. Alfonso de' Liguori, edited by the Fathers of the Oratory, and approved and recommended by Cardinal Wiseman, may satisfy them. 'The works of S. Alphonso not only do not 'contain any proposition whatever which can be called schisma-'tical or scandalous, but also none which are either pernicious, 'erroneous, or rash; the morals, therefore, of this saintly Bishop 'cannot be censured without setting up as a censor of authority 'itself; without, in fine, censuring the decision of the Holy See.'

The character of Rome's moral teaching is then irrevocably tied to the character of Liguori's teaching. And it must not be thought that he is the representative of a lax school among Romish Casuists. On the contrary, he makes it his greatest boast that he is not an extreme man, that he is not over-strict or over-lax, but holds the middle course. 'In completing 'this work,' he says in his Preface to his *Homo Apostolicus*, speaking of the *Theologia Moralis*, 'I have toiled for fifteen 'years, going over and weighing the teaching of very many

[1] P. xviii. The *Glorie di Maria* is a book which S. Alfonso tells us that he has printed for the sake of providing Priests with materials for sermons on Saturdays, and for *Novenas* in honour of S. Mary. From the headings to the chapters we learn that S. Mary is Queen of Mercy and our loving Mother; that she obtains us the pardon of our sins and perseverance, and renders death sweet; that she is the Hope of all; that her Intercession is necessary for our salvation; that she is a tender Advocate, able to save all; that she is the Peace-maker between sinners and God; that she delivers her clients from hell, succours her clients in purgatory, and leads her servants to heaven; that she is the Treasury of all divine graces; that she offered to God the life of her Son; that she is the Queen of Martyrs;—together with many more 'new inventions of honours,' as Father F. W. Faber approvingly terms them. Cardinal Wiseman cordially recommends the English translation to the faithful. So do we. We think few books on the subject more instructive.

'writers whom I have examined. Some I found too indulgent, 'for led by a false zeal for expediting the salvation of souls, 'they have granted too much liberty, not without prejudice to 'the laws divine and ecclesiastical; and others I found who, 'detesting so great compliance, have fallen into the other extreme 'of excessive rigour. This has been my greatest labour, to 'select from such a congeries of opinions those sentiments 'which on one side have due regard to the precepts of God 'and of the Church, and which on the other do not add burdens 'which have not been imposed by God, nor tie every one to a 'perfection which human weakness renders morally impossible 'to the common run of the faithful.' And again in the preface to the *Theologia Moralis* itself: 'So I have determined to 'publish this new work to hold a middle place between too lax 'and too severe opinions.' And in his tract upon Conscience: 'I protest that as I do not approve of confessors who adhere to 'over-great austerity, and condemn using a number of opinions 'which rest on a grave foundation; so on the other hand, I 'cannot approve of those who easily admit opinions as probable, 'which are without sure foundation.'[1] In fact Liguori is a safe *via media* man, as Rome counts safeness.[2]

At first sight there seems a certain degree of security in an Authorized Book of Morals, but second thoughts will show that such an impression is altogether unfounded. It can only be a help on the side of liberty, not on that of strictness. No sort of lax opinions are thus put down. They stand upon their own ground, just as though there were no such book at all. They are neither approved nor condemned, and are left to the individual conscience. But all the opinions which are given and commended in such a book, whether strict or lax, are thenceforward

[1] Theol. Mor. l. i. 83.

[2] The strict school consists of Merbesius, Contensonius, Natalis Alexander, Juenius, Cabassutius, Collet, Genettus, Petrocorensis, and Concina, almost all of whom, it will be seen, are Gallicans. It was really for its strict moral teaching, and not for its speculative dogmas, that Jansenism, the child of Gallicanism, was proscribed. 'The Jansenists,' says their enemy Francolinius, 'have their Theology, both speculative, and practical or moral: their speculative Theology is Jansenism, their practical or moral Theology is Rigorism. This has three principles. To make very much of the Fathers, little of the Pontiffs, nothing of modern Theologians. To pay true regard to the Fathers, as quoted by themselves, a pretended regard to the Pontiffs, to the other Doctors neither one nor the other. Never to leave S. Augustin, real or spurious, and not interpret the Doctor by Councils, but Councils by him: sometimes to go near Pontiffs when teaching *ex cathedrâ* and to profess to do so—if, that is, they are not against them. Always to avoid Schoolmen, especially those of the two last ages, in controversies with respect to morals, both in subject and in manner of speech, and not even to read them, far less make honourable mention of them in their writings and books.' Well would it have been for France and for the Christian Church, had not maligned Jansenism fallen beneath the calumnies and the violence of its semi-Pelagian assailants! And well would it be for France now if she could recall the spirit of her Arnauds and her Pascals, instead of cherishing in her bosom the extremes of Ultramontanism!

sacred. The only result, therefore, is, that if there are any lax opinions in it, those opinions receive a sanction, without which a conscientious mind would not have allowed itself to adopt them.

The evils of this are shown in the case of Equivocation. As we have already shown, a person committed to the defence of Liguori's Theory of Truthfulness must maintain, that when asked a question which cannot but be answered in the affirmative, it is truthful to reply, '*I say, no;*' intending the questioner to understand that you deny his question, but meaning in your own mind simply to affirm that you are making use of the word *no* in the course of your conversation.[1] He must justify the once well-known principle, Ἡ γλῶσσ' ὀμώμοχ', ἡ δὲ φρὴν ἀνώμοτος; for that is identical with the principle adopted by Liguori, that when a man has sworn only externally, he has not sworn, he has joked.[2] He must hold that a man may insert a *not* into an affirmative sentence in a whisper, not heard so as to be understood by the other party, and that his oath is then truthful, though he means to swear *no*, and the other conceives that he is swearing *yes*.[3] He must maintain that a witness in a court of justice has not only the liberty of lying, but that it is his duty to lie, if the crime about which his evidence is required is otherwise unknown.[4] He must not dare to express indignation at the four answers allowed to the adulterous wife: 1. That

---

[1] Theol. Mor. l. iv. 151. [2] L. iv. 171. [3] L. iv. 168.

[4] L. iv. 154.—In the trial of Boyle *v.* Wiseman, which took place in the course of the month of August of the present year, the object of the plaintiff's counsel being to prove that the defendant had written a letter which had been published with his name, the following is reported as having occurred: 'Dr. T. Grant was then examined. He said, "I am the Roman Catholic Bishop of S. George's, Southwark. I know the defendant, and am upon intimate terms with him. I remember going to Paris on the subject of this libel, but *I don't remember* having had any conversation with the defendant relating to it. I had a conversation with a gentleman belonging to the *Univers* journal, but he did not give me any MS. I am quite sure the defendant never told me that he wrote the letter signed 'Nicholas, Cardinal Wiseman,' which is the subject of the present action." The Rev. George Spencer, known as Father Ignatius, was the next witness. He said, "I am intimately acquainted with Cardinal Wiseman, but I don't see much of him. I remember reading the article in the *Catholic Standard*, and I had a few words with the Cardinal on the subject. *All I can remember* that he said was that he had reason to know that Boyle had communicated the article that appeared in the *Ami de la Religion*. He did not say a word of the authorship of the letter." "Did you say to him, 'I have read your letter, Cardinal Wiseman?'" "*I don't remember.*" (The witness gave his evidence in such a low tone and so confusedly, that the jury several times requested him to speak louder and more plainly, as they could not hear what he said.) "I cannot say how the conversation began. The Cardinal did not send me to the plaintiff to try to arrange this matter, but I did go to Mr. Ivors on the subject.—*I don't remember* the words that passed afterwards between me and the Cardinal. I am certain he did not tell me the letter was his, and I did not tell him that it was his. I went to the plaintiff (Mr. Boyle) of my own accord, and I afterwards communicated with the Cardinal. My object was to endeavour to settle this action." "Surely you can tell us what passed between you?" "*No, I do not remember.*" "Why how long ago is it since this occurred?" "About a month." "And you mean to swear you have no recollection of what occurred?" "I do: *I only recollect* what I have

she had not broken the marriage (meaning to herself that the marriage was still existing); 2. That she was innocent of the crime (meaning to herself that she had been absolved of the guilt of the crime after confession); 3. That she had not committed adultery (meaning to herself that she had not committed idolatry); 4. That she had not committed adultery (meaning to herself so as to have to tell her husband).[1] He must not denounce as wicked the doctrine that a man who has seduced a maiden, on promise of marrying her, is *not* bound to keep his promise, if he is of considerably higher birth, or if he is considerably richer, whether the victim did or did not know of any disparity between him and herself.[2] If he is a 'good Catholic,' he will hold with the Cardinal Archbishop of Besançon, that on these points 'the 'judgment of Rome should be fully adhered to, and that the 'opinions of the Blessed Alfonso de' Liguori should be followed 'and reduced to practice, all doubt whatever being thrown aside.' If not so enthusiastic as the Cardinal Archbishop, yet he is absolutely bound to hold that the above teaching is not erroneous, rash, scandalous, offensive to pious ears, ill-sounding or misleading to the simple.

We will now examine the Theory of Theft; and we shall see there the same evil as in the case of Equivocation—laxity encouraged by the sanction of authority: and we shall, in another instance, learn what is the nature of that morality which Rome inculcates through her Confessors and her Directors.

'What is theft? It is the secret and unjust taking-away of a thing belonging to another, when the owner is reasonably unwilling.'—L. iv. 518.

---

told you." "What else did the Cardinal say? What did he say relative to the matter?" "*I don't recollect.*"'

We have no cause for thinking that Bishop Grant and Father Ignatius are gifted with good memories; therefore we conclude that they have short memories. But it is an interesting inquiry, as a purely speculative question, What must they have done on the received principles of Roman Moral Theology if they *had* recollected that Cardinal Wiseman had told them that he was the author of the letter signed by his name? They must have done exactly what they did. Otherwise, they would have 'sinned by discovering the truth which they ought to have concealed.' (L. v. 270.) '*If in a trial the crime is altogether concealed, the witness may, nay he is bound, to say that the defendant has not committed it.*' (L. iv. 154.) This would be exactly our hypothetical case: for in matter of fact, the trial was quashed because 'the crime' of having written the libel was 'concealed;' therefore 'the witnesses were bound,' even if they had known the contrary to be true, 'to say the defendant had not committed it.' This is, to say the least, remarkable. We should scarcely have thought it possible—indeed without S. Alfonso's assistance we never should have thought it possible—that when English gentlemen were giving evidence upon their oath in an English court of justice, and were questioned as to whether or no they recollected something taking place, they should be religiously and morally bound not to allow the fact of their recollection or non-recollection to make any difference in their answer.

[1] L. iv. 162. [2] L. iv. 644.

This is an awkward beginning. Who is to be the judge, whether the owner is reasonable or unreasonable in wishing to keep his goods himself? If he is likely to have a prejudice on the side of possession, the thief is at least as likely to have a prejudice on the side of abstraction. We suppose that it will be necessary to call in the Director to settle the point between them.[1]

Having got our definition of theft, we may see what acts of taking other people's goods are not thieving, which unenlightened consciences might conceive to be such. Five kinds of such acts are at once enumerated. The first is that of a man who takes what is another's by way of joke. We may let that pass. 'I only did it in fun,' has always been accounted a sufficient excuse to save a schoolboy from anything beyond a reprimand. At the same time such jokes might be unpleasant: and, if we are to judge from this and from the other case, already mentioned, of the man who swore only externally, and therefore did not swear but joked, Liguori must have a very dismal notion of jesting.

The next is that of one who takes what is another's for the latter's good or advantage, 'As if a wife take away money from 'her husband, that he may not waste it on games or feasting, or 'take away wine from him that he may not get drunk, or *an 'heretical book that he may not read it;* or if a servant gives a 'very poor man alms of no very great amount, which his master 'would not be reasonably unwilling that he should give, although 'for shame, or some other reason, he does not dare to ask him.' This is a principle which might be extensively applied, especially if it should happen that a lady were married to an heretical husband. But we shall have occasion again to consider the case of wives, children, and servants separately.

The third case of taking not thieving carries us up at once to first principles.

'It is certain that a man who is in extreme necessity may purloin other people's goods, enough to free himself from such a necessity. So the doctors hold, "in common,"[2] with S. Thomas. The holy Doctor's reason is, that in such a case all things are common, for the law of nations by which a division of goods was made, cannot derogate from natural law by which every man is allowed to provide for himself, so long as he labours under extreme necessity. The same is said when the necessity is next to extreme or equivalent to it, for in such a necessity, which is called very grave or quasi-extreme, a man may also provide for himself,' (mark the euphemism)

[1] In the *Homo Apostolicus*, the cases in which the owner is regarded as unreasonable in his unwillingness to part with his goods to the thief are when the latter is in extreme necessity, or when he is justly compensating himself, but no such limit to his unreasonableness is laid down in the *Theologia Moralis*.

[2] For the technical meaning of 'common opinion,' and of 'probable and more probable opinion,' we must refer our readers to the *Christian Remembrancer*, No. LXXXIII. Jan. 1854, p. 44.

'by ordinary means, but not by strange and extraordinary. So, "in common," Lugo, Lessius, Sporer, the Salamanca Doctors, Navarrus, Soto, Cajetan, Prado, &c., Viva, Sylvius, Azorius, Croix, Cardenas, Haunoldus, and Tamburini, the last of whom calls the opinion certain. But a very grave necessity of this kind is supposed to exist when a man is in probable risk of incurring death, or indeed in danger of losing some principal member, or some sense, such as an eye; also when a man is in danger of falling into perpetual captivity, or being sent to the galleys, or catching a very grave or lasting disease, or incurring loss of character. For it is not necessary that evils of this kind should be actually upon the man, but it is enough that they are very near him, and morally certain, or indeed—Holzmann says—if there is certainly probable danger of them. But it is doubted whether a father is supposed to labour under the same necessity if he is in danger of prostituting his daughter through want. Bonacina says Yes, and Mazzotta, Cajetan, Suarez, &c., agree. But "with greater probability" the Salamanca Doctors say No, because no necessity can compel a man to sin when there is any other way of relieving his necessity, such as at least he has in begging. But what, if a nobleman is very much ashamed to beg or to work, can he provide for himself out of other people's goods? The Salamanca Doctors say No, with Soto and Prado, on the ground that this must be rather counted grave than extreme necessity, temporal goods being ordained only for preserving life, not for keeping honour. But Viva says Yes, and Roncaglia and Mazzotta, as well as Lessius, Palao, and Diocastillo in Croix: so do Bannez and Serra. And this seems to me the "more probable," if he is so ashamed of begging that he would rather die than beg.'—L. iv. 520.

Six times in the course of three pages in his *Homo Apostolicus*, sixteen times in the course of one section of a chapter in his *Theologia Moralis*, Liguori lays down the principle that, as soon as a man is reduced to extreme necessity, all goods become common, and, more than this, that the thief—we beg pardon, the clandestine taker—has a right to what belongs to others. We need not say that we here find ourselves referred to the fundamental principle of Communism, just as Mariana appeals to the fundamental principle of Red Republicanism, when he asserts that every private man has a right to stab the king who has been declared a public enemy.[1]

Now that a case might arise in which circumstances would justify appropriation is a proposition which we do not deny, and

[1] 'Any private man, whoever he may be, has a right equal to the best, to kill the king declared a public enemy: let him only have the will to fling away hopes of impunity, despise the risk, and dare attempt to serve his country. I never will believe that he who makes essay to slay him has done anything whatever which he has not a right to do. . . . It is indeed more virtuous and more magnanimous openly to satisfy the grudge and fall upon the country's enemy before the eyes of all the world. But there is more prudence in trying to catch him, as in a trap, by artifice. For then the happy issue comes without tumult and with the certainty of less danger, public as well as private. . . . Whether open force is resorted to, and he is struck down in the midst of insurrection and arms publicly taken up . . . or with greater caution he dies by stratagem or device, a single man devoting himself, or a few sworn together secretly against his life and struggling each at his own peril to redeem his country safe! Suppose that they escape! Like great demi-deities they are revered their whole life long. And if they fall, they fall a sacrifice grateful to the gods and grateful unto men, in a noble undertaking, and are illustrious to all posterity!'—Mariana, pp. 60, 65, as quoted in *Cases of Conscience*, p. 51.

it is this modicum of truth which blinds Liguori and his followers in the instance before us. If it be true that it might happen, under very peculiar circumstances, that a man might be justified in appropriating what was not his, it does not follow that it should be laid down as a general rule to guide practice that as soon as a man is reduced to extreme necessity he is relieved from paying any regard to the laws of property: and then that the term 'extreme necessity' should be so liberally interpreted as to include under it every distressed nobleman. Take this last case and analyze it. It is precisely the case of the Unjust Steward, provided that the latter was a man of high birth, or indeed even that would not be necessary, for *vir honoratus* would scarcely mean more than a man holding a respectable position. This parable has caused much difficulty to such commentators as did not mark that 'the lord' there spoken of is like the Steward himself, a man of the earth, earthy, and, in addition, that the commendation does not belong to the morality of the act done, but to the cleverness displayed in doing it. No such difficulties need be felt by them if they will take Liguori for their guide. 'I cannot dig, to beg I am ashamed.' Then says S. Alfonso, you are justified in clandestinely taking. 'If 'a man in an honourable position is very much ashamed to beg 'or to work, may he provide for himself out of other persons' 'goods? The Salamanca Doctors &c. say No—but Viva &c. say 'Yes, and this seems to me the "more probable."' The ingenuity which has contrived to bring the distressed nobleman into the category of those labouring under extreme necessity, is as commendable as the Unjust Steward's own cleverness. The method in which it is done is as follows:—It was necessary to make some kind of explanation of what extreme necessity is. In doing this it appeared hard to be too strict and rigid, and so *extreme* necessity was softened down into *grave* necessity. So Lessius, Malderus, &c. Here, however, Innocent XI. stepped in—that same Innocent who, as we have seen, attempted to put a stop to the practice of Mental Restriction. But he and his Jansenist morality has fared no better in the matter of Theft than in that of Untruthfulness. Then, as we may recollect, on his condemning mental restriction, mental restriction was divided into two classes, morally undistinguishable, pure mental restriction, and non-pure mental restriction, and his condemnation was confined by the Casuists to the former. Here he condemns the proposition 'that it is allowable to steal not only in extreme but also in grave necessity.' The Casuists hear and obey the Papal voice. But the Pontiff spoke only of *grave*, he said nothing of *very grave* necessity: so *gravi* is changed into *gravissimâ*, and the Jansenist Pope's decree goes for nothing. To permit a man to

steal in grave necessity is immoral, says Innocent. True, but to permit a man to steal in very grave necessity is moral, reply the Casuists, and we have the privilege of explaining what 'very grave' means. This they accordingly proceed to do. And first a man is to be considered labouring under very grave necessity, if he is in probable danger of incurring death—next, if he is in danger of losing a principal limb—then, if he is in very near risk of being imprisoned for life—or of being sent to the galleys —or of catching a very bad disease—or of incurring disgrace. This last heading covers the case of the distressed nobleman. He would feel disgraced if he were to dig or to beg; therefore he is *unable* to have recourse to this method of relieving his wants, and is labouring under very grave or quasi-extreme need. That is all that is necessary. At once the laws of *meum* and *tuum*, so far as he is concerned, have perished. He may take what he wants. In providing for his needs out of other people's goods he cannot steal if he would. But if a man's want is so pressing that he is in risk of prostituting his daughter, the same authority tells us that that does not justify him in 'providing for himself.' To save his own character in the eyes of men he may take clandestinely. To save his daughter's ruin of body and soul he may not.

In connexion with this subject of extreme necessity, there are, says Liguori, many difficult questions. They are, 1., whether men in captivity to the Turks may purloin what is not theirs, and whether rich men are bound to redeem them. To this question Rome's oracle replies: 'In this doubt, which 'has heaped upon me a mighty confusion, and on which the 'Doctors speak so obscurely, I dare not decide anything. It is 'enough to have put forward the arguments of both sides. 'Let the wiser judge.' Question 2. is, whether a poor man in extreme necessity may secretly purloin (*occulte alienum surripere*) without going through the previous ceremony of begging. To this Coninchius answers in the negative; Lessius, Layman, and Concina, in a qualified affirmative; Cardinal Lugo and Liguori have recourse to a *distinguendum*. In reply to Question 3. we learn that 'no one is bound to spend so much as 600*l.* or '800*l.* to save another man's life, although the donor should 'not lose his station by giving more.' Question 4. asks if the thief who consumes what he has taken away in extreme necessity has to restore it. Palao, Concina, Navarrus, Diana, Sporer, Lessius, and Tamburini, are on the negative side, 'On 'the grounds that, as in extreme necessity all things become 'common, the thief has not only the right of taking others' 'goods, but also of consuming them, just as he has the right 'of purloining again.' Lessius, Sylvius, Armilla, Azorius, and

Concina, are on the other side. Liguori thinks both 'probable."[1] The 5th question is whether the purloiner is bound to restore when his extreme necessity has ceased. Here there are three opinions. The first, affirmative, supported by seven Doctors; the second, negative, supported by eight Doctors; the third, a *distinguendum*, supported by twelve Doctors. Question 6. asks, If a rich man, who does not help a poor man in extreme necessity, is afterward bound to restore? Here there are eight Doctors on the affirmative side, nine on the negative, which Liguori says is the 'more probable;' 'for, though the poor man 'has a right to take the rich man's goods, yet the same justice 'does not require the rich man to give.'[2]

The next case of purloining not thieving, is 'when a man 'takes by way of just compensation, if he cannot otherwise get 'what is due to him; *e. g.* if a servant cannot get just wages 'otherwise, or if he has been unfairly induced to undertake the 'place at an unfair price.' This being a liberty given especially to domestics (though not confined to them), we shall defer its consideration till we are able to take a panoramic view of the indulgences granted by Rome to wives, children, and servants, to take clandestinely at the expense of the master of the house. At present we will content ourselves with Pascal's illustration of the principle in the story of John d'Alba.

'"Father Bauny," said the monk, "has established a prime maxim in favour of those who are not content with their wages: 'May servants who are dissatisfied with their wages use means to raise them, by laying hands on as much of the property of their masters as they may consider necessary to make the said wages equivalent to their trouble? They may, in certain circumstances; as when they are so poor that, in looking for a situation, they have been obliged to accept the offer made to them; and when other servants of the same class are gaining more than they elsewhere.'" "Ha, Father!" cried I, "that is John d'Alba's passage, I declare." "What John d'Alba?" inquired the Father; "what do you mean?" "Strange, Father," returned I, "do you not remember what happened in this city in the year 1647? Where in the world were you living at that time?" "I was teaching Cases of Conscience in one of our colleges at a distance from Paris," he replied.

'"I see you don't know the story, Father: I must tell it you. I heard it related the other day by a man of honour whom I met in company. He told us that this John d'Alba, who was in the service of your fathers, in the College of Clermont, in the Rue St. Jacques, being dissatisfied with his wages, had purloined something to make himself amends; and that your fathers, on discovering the theft, had thrown him into prison on the charge

[1] Elsewhere we find:—'If a man gets something by borrowing, hiring or asking, and then consumes it in extreme necessity, he is not bound to make restitution. Nay, "probably" he is not bound to restore what he has previously stolen and afterwards consumed in this necessity, because his stealing does not take away from him the right which in such a case he had to the thing, no more than if he had taken it when actually in the necessity and consumed it.'—L. iv. 623.

[2] L. iv. 520.

of larceny. His case was reported to the court, if I recollect right, on the 16th of April, 1647; for he was very minute in his statements, and, indeed, they would hardly have been credible otherwise. The poor fellow, on being questioned, confessed to *having taken* some pewter plates, but maintained, nevertheless, that he *had not stolen* them; pleading in his defence this very doctrine of Father Bauny, which he produced before the judges, along with a pamphlet by one of your fathers, under whom he had studied Cases of Conscience, and who had taught him the same thing. Whereupon M. De Montrouge, one of the most respected members of the court, said, in giving his opinion, 'That he did not see how they could discharge the accused on the ground of these fathers' writings, containing as they did a doctrine so illegal, pernicious, and contrary to all laws, natural, divine, and human, and calculated to ruin all families, and sanction all sorts of household robbery. But his opinion was, that this too faithful disciple should be whipped before the college-gate by the hand of the common hangman, who should at the same time burn the writings of those fathers which treated of larceny, with certification that they were prohibited from teaching such doctrines in future, upon pain of death."

'"The result of this judgment, which was heartily approved of, was waited for with much curiosity, when some incident occurred which made them delay proceedings. But in the meantime the prisoner disappeared nobody knew how, and nothing more was heard about the affair; so that John d'Alba got off, pewter plates and all. Such was the account he gave us; to which he added, that the judgment of M. De Montrouge was entered on the records of the court, where any one may consult it. We were highly amused with the anecdote." "What are you trifling about now?" cried the monk; "what does all that signify? I was explaining the maxims of our Casuists, and was just going to speak of those relating to gentlemen, when you interrupt me with impertinent stories." "It was something suggested by the way, Father," I observed.'—*Letter* vi.

We will only add here that John d'Alba would, as we shall presently show, be equally justified by S. Alfonso's system of morals, as by that of Father Bauny, in spite of another fruitless attempt of Innocent XI., which we shall notice in its place. The last case of purloining not thieving is interesting to our Eastern *protegés* at the present moment, and may be of some advantage to our French allies—more, happily, to them than to our own soldiers—in preparing their commissariat on the Danube. All, and more than all, that the Emperor of Russia requires for his justification is freely allowed him. The Czar's claim is not a tenth part as bold as that of Molina, Cajetan, Victorelli, Naldus, Duvallius, Rebellus, Velasquez, Covarruvias and Diana, any one of which theologians is of sufficient authority to make the opinion which he espouses 'probable,' and therefore enough for a sovereign to act upon.

'A bye-question here arises whether Christians may lawfully purloin the property of Turks? If Christians are captives in Turkish territories, it is certain that they may purloin from their masters enough for their redemption and for their return home, by way of compensation for their unjust slavery, and the losses which they consequently suffer. This is according to a decree of the Sacred Congregation, Aug. 23, 1630, in which it is declared—"Captives, unjustly detained by unbelievers, may take from their own masters, without doing wrong, enough for a proper compensation

to the amount of their redemption, from them, or from others who belong to the state, whether it be Jewish or Turkish." The only real question is, if *every* Christian, without distinction, may purloin the goods of Turks. Azorius and Filliuccius say No, but, "with probability," Molina and Cajetan say Yes. So do Victorelli, Naldus, Duvallius, Rebellus, Velasquez, Covarruvias, and others in Diana, who also holds it "probable." The reason is, that it may be rightly presumed that every Christian has this permission given him by Christian sovereigns, who have a right'—[hear it, O Nicholas!]—'to despoil Turks of all their goods and of the territories usurped by them. Felix Potesta agrees in this, provided that (as he rightly limits it) there be not among the Turks a time of truce, or of safe-conduct, and provided that it do not apply to any single Turk living in Christian countries, whether free or a slave, especially if he is there as a public official under royal protection.'—L. iv. 525.

So much for purloining which is not thieving. We now proceed to venial thieving. 'Mortal sin,' the *Homo Apostolicus* says, 'is that which deprives man of divine grace, which is 'the life of the soul, and is therefore called mortal. Venial sin 'is that which does not deprive of grace, and does not diminish 'God's love towards us, but does diminish our love towards 'God.'[1] The distinction between mortal and venial sin being so enormous—venial sins being so trifling, that we are told a man does not sin gravely who deliberately determines to commit every venial sin under the sun—it is very important to see what are the conditions which bring acts under one class or the other.[2] That there are some sins less offensive to God, which, if we please, we may call venial, and some sins more offensive to God, which, if we please, we may call mortal, we do not deny; but it is clear that according to any system which is not wholly unspiritual, it must depend altogether upon the disposition of mind in which the sin is committed, whether it is light or grave; and that to lay down an abstract chart in which certain sins are dotted down as venial, and certain others as mortal, is intellectually ludicrous and morally unprincipled. Rome's theologians think otherwise. One of the chief purposes of such books as that which we are reviewing is to classify all acts as respectively venial and mortal. The rules by which these writers have to direct themselves in deciding between the two classes, are three:—All sins requiring advertence on the part of the intellect, and consent on the part of the will; a sin is not mortal unless the advertence be full and

[1] Hom. Apost. Tract. iii. 66. Vide *Christian Remembrancer*, No. LXXXIII. p. 44, for a further explanation of 'mortal and venial sin.'

[2] 'Does any Christian man sin gravely who determines to commit every venial sin? Sanchez and Bonacina say Yes, because, as S. Thomas teaches, venial sins naturally dispose towards mortal sin: but, "with greater probability," Palao and Antony of the Holy Ghost say No; (provided however that he does not act in contempt, and is not in proximate risk of falling into mortal sin, which he may learn from his past experience). The reason is, that really a purpose of this only conduces in a remote manner to mortal sin.'—Theol. Mor. l. v. 12.

the consent be perfect. So far good: those two rules, if assailable on any other ground, are not liable to the charge of unspirituality. But there is a third: for a sin to be mortal there is also required 'gravity of matter;' and hard are the shifts to which those who try to divest Rome's morals of a hard, dry, calculating, mechanical character, are driven to explain what this 'gravity of matter' is. Sometimes they will say that it means 'the gravity of the sin;' but 'matter' and 'sin' are not the same thing; and Liguori, in so many words, distinguishes them. Sometimes they will say that it means 'the objective and material badness of the act.' This is less tenable than the former; and so at last they are compelled to acquiesce in the simple account given of it by all the commentators on S. Thomas Aquinas, and adopted from them by S. Alfonso. We will take Cardinal de Lugo's account, as representing the earlier writers. He says:—

'It is certain that in this (*i.e.* in stealing) a sin may be allowed to be light, not only on account of defect of advertence, but also on account of levity of matter. The whole difficulty is in determining how much matter is enough for a mortal sin of theft. . . . Though we can with certainty determine some matter to be small, viz. an obol or penny, and other matter to be certainly grave, viz. 20*l.*; yet between these two extremes we cannot define what approaches to each of these two matters, so as to be light if up to that sum, and grave if beyond it.'—*Lugo de Just.* d. 16. n. 27, 28.

The meaning, then, of gravity of matter in the case of theft is the amount stolen. If the amount stolen is equal to a certain quantity, which is called notable, then the theft is *in grave matter*, and (supposing that it is committed with full advertence and perfect consent), the act is a mortal sin. If it is below that quantity, then the theft is *in light matter*, and (in spite of full advertence and perfect consent) the act is a venial sin. S. Alfonso accordingly asks, on the subject of theft,—

'What is notable quantity for mortal sin?' . . . 'Various are the opinions on this subject. Navarrus, with too great scrupulousness, says that 2½*d.* is enough; others, with too great laxity, say 2*l.* 10*s.*; with greater moderation, Toletus, Medina, Lessius, &c. say 10*d.*, though less than that is enough, if it does notable damage.'—L. iv. 526.

These authors are but rough artists. As yet, we may observe, the attempt is to fix an *absolute* sum, settling at once (as one of three conditions) the spiritual price of each theft; viz. below 10*d.* purgatory, above 10*d.* eternal death. But what this absolute sum should be, it was difficult to decide. There is some difference between 2*l.* 10*s.* and 2½*d.*; nor does 10*d.* seem a fair medium between them. But by degrees the science grows more exact, and it is determined that the sum fixed must be *relative*, not absolute; and that it must be higher or lower, according to the circumstances of the person from whom the thief steals.

'What is grave quantity with respect to different sorts of persons, or to different circumstances? ... The Doctors say "in common," that in theft that is grave matter which would be enough for a man to support himself and his family with for a day, according to their condition in life, counting, as Croix, Sporer, Gomez and others well note, not only his board, but also the price of his clothing and lodging. But as this rule is very obscure and confused, and cannot be applied to all without exception, we will bring forward the Doctors who fix what is grave matter for different kinds of persons.

'1. With respect to poor mendicants, Habert, Elbel, Sporer, and Holzmann, fix on a few coins as grave matter. But others "more commonly" fix 5*d.*, or sometimes even 2½*d.* (but rarely, as the Salamanca Doctors say). So Busembaum, Lessius, Bonacina, Viva, Anacletus, Escobar, Renzi, Mazzotta, Wigandt, with Bannez and Serra; so too Navarrus, Reginald, and Diana in Lugo.

'2. With respect to poor labourers, speaking generally, Layman and Lugo say that anything equal in value to a day's maintenance, or to the ordinary wages which are given to a labourer for a day, is grave matter. Others, however, speak more distinctly. Roncaglia and Habert fix 5*d.* for grave matter; but others "more commonly" say 10*d.*, both for labourers and artizans or mechanics. So Layman, Lessius, Medina, Bonacina, Viva, Wigandt, Concina, Renzi, Escobar, Mazzotta, Tamburini, Busembaum, Holzmann, Serra in the Salamanca Doctors, and Navarrus, Reginald, and Diana in Lugo. Nevertheless, Soto, and Peter Navarrus in Lessius, require for artizans more than 10*d.* to make grave matter, and so Elbel and Potesta say; Filliuccius requires 1*s.* 3*d.*, Lugo 1*s.* 8*d.* Hence I say with "probability," that 10*d.* is enough for labourers, but that for artizans at least 1*s.* 0½*d.* is required for grave matter, if they earn as much or more a day. Habert, however, rightly notes that if a workman supported himself with difficulty, earning 7*d.* or 8*d.* a day, such an amount would be grave in regard to him.

'3. With respect to men rich in a common or ordinary way, men who live on their own income, Concina and Roncaglia fix 1*s.* 3*d.* for grave matter, Layman about 2*s.* 6*d.*; but "more commonly," Busembaum, Lessius, Bonacina, Gordon, Habert, Viva, Anacletus, with Peter Navarrus, Elbel, Tamburini, Holzmann, Potesta, Wigandt, Bannez, Serra, Reginald, Diana, with the Salamanca Doctors, say that for these 1*s.* 8*d.* is grave matter. Nay, Filliuccius, Escobar, Mazzotta, Renzi, and Tamburini extend it to 2*s.* 1*d.* Viva, however, rightly notices that this does not apply to men who live very closely, although they do live on their own income: in their case I certainly think 1*s.* 3*d.* is grave matter; nay even less in the case of those who keep themselves and their household in exceedingly wretched plight. On the other hand, for a person absolutely wealthy, Sporer requires 2*s.* 1*d.*, Lugo 2*s.* 6*d.* or 2*s.* 11*d.* But with regard to tradesmen of small fortune, I think that 1*s.* 0½*d.* is grave matter. For others of moderate fortune, I think, with Elbel, Viva, Anacletus, and Croix, 1*s.* 8*d.* For a very rich tradesman Croix requires 3*s.* 4*d.* Tamburini, Renzi, and Potesta require 5*s.* But Layman, Elbel, Holzmann, Angelus, Sylvester, Rodriguez, Peter of Aragon, Antony of Cordova in the Salamanca Doctors, require 2*s.* 1*d.*

'4. With respect to very rich noblemen, Sylvester, Angelus, Peter of Aragon, Antony of Cordova and Rodriguez in the Salamanca Doctors, require more than 10*s.* for grave matter; Viva, Elbel, Sporer and Croix, at least 10*s.*; but "more commonly" it is said that 5*s.* is enough for grave matter, by Bonacina, Gordon, Mazzotta, Filliuccius, Anacletus, Tamburini, Lugo, Navarrus, Reginald, Diana, Lessius, Soto, Peter Navarrus, Roncaglia, Holzmann. And Filliuccius, Roncaglia, Holzmann, and Lugo, say that this applies to kings too, because though, absolutely regarded, 5*s.* may seem light matter to them, yet really, they say, considering the burdens and functions of kings,

it is grave. The Salamanca Doctors say that 7*s.* 6*d.* at least, is enough for kings. Others however "probably" say that at least 10*s.* is required, as Croix, Bonacina, Busembaum, Sporer, Mazzotta, Elbel, Tamburini, Viva and Serra in the Salamanca Doctors. Nay, Potesta requires more than 10*s.* for kings, and very many others extend it to 15*s.*; as Wigandt, Bannez, Serra, Layman, Peter Navarrus, Angelus, Sylvester, Soto, Peter of Aragon, Rodriguez, Antony of Cordova, and the "common opinion," as Layman says.

'5. With respect to a community, Sanchez and Cardenas in Croix, think that 5*s.* is always grave matter; but Croix says "probably," that if the community were very rich, grave matter might be extended further, so that it did not exceed 10*s.*

'Conclusion, and "more probable opinion." From all this I draw, in conclusion, what seems to me "more probable." 1. With respect to mendicants, I think that 5*d.* is grave matter, or still less, if any poor persons gain less per day by alms. 2. With respect to labourers and similar workmen, commonly speaking, 10*d.*; for artizans, 1*s.* 0½*d.* 3. With respect to ordidarily or moderately rich men, 1*s.* 8*d.*; and less for those who live in wretched plight or on their own goods; but for the absolutely rich, 2*s.* 1*d.* or 2*s.* 6*d.*; and I think the same for very opulent tradesmen. 4. With respect to very rich noblemen, 5*s.*; and I think the same for a very opulent community—at least for this, I think that 7*s.* 6*d.* is enough for grave matter. With respect to kings, 10*s.*'—L. iv. 527, 528.

Is this morality or arithmetic? And what does it all mean? It means this. First, the principle is admitted that unless a certain quantity is stolen a sin of theft is not mortal. Then, as Cardinal Lugo says, comes the difficult task of fixing what this sum must be. At first an absolute sum was fixed for all cases, whether 2½*d.*, or 10*d.*, or 2*l.* 10*s.* It was soon seen that that would not do, and so the absolute sum was changed into a sum relative to the income of the sufferer. Still, however, more exactness was demanded, and men were accordingly divided into so many classes, and a certain sum affixed to each one of these classes. He who stole anything under the sum fixed for each class from any member of that class sinned venially; he who stole as much as the sum fixed sinned mortally. On the question, What should be the recognised scale of prices? we have seen that doctors have considerably disagreed. The last tariff, the one with which we have to do, is as follows:—

	s.	*d.*
With respect to mendicants	0	5
With respect to labourers	0	10
With respect to artizans	1	0½
With respect to moderately rich men. . . .	1	8
With respect to absolutely rich men	2	6
With respect to very rich noblemen	5	0
With respect to a very rich community . . .	7	6
With respect to kings	10	0[1]

[1] In the same way that the theory of predication in Logic is supposed to be made more perfect by the quantification not only of the subject but also of the

Now mark the inexpressibly absurd consequences resulting from laying down scales of this nature. Let there be 2*s.* 6*d.* lying on the table—let a man with full knowledge that God's law forbids him to appropriate it, yet wilfully and deliberately steal it for present gratification, nay, let there be added in his mind a malicious feeling of hatred against the owner. Is it not clear that he has been guilty of as perfect an act of theft as could be committed? that in God's sight he is a malicious thief, and must bear his burden accordingly? *Distinguendum* answers Rome. We must first ask to whom that 2*s.* 6*d.* belonged. If it belonged to a mendicant, if it belonged to a labourer, if it belonged to an artizan, if it belonged to a moderately rich man or to an absolutely rich man, then it is true the sin of theft was mortal. But in case that it belonged to a very rich nobleman, a very rich community, or to a king, the character of the act is changed; two of the conditions of a mortal act of theft are fulfilled, but the third is wanting. True, the man's mind, soul, and spirit remain in exactly the same disposition, but he has not stolen enough. He is excused from mortal sin on the ground of levity of matter. He has but committed a venial act of theft, and for that God's love is not diminished towards him, though his own love towards God is dulled. He need not confess what he has done.

Again, suppose a man standing between a country squire and a rich peer. Let him be affected exactly in the same manner and degree towards each. Let him know and bear in mind that God has forbidden him to take what does not belong to him, but let him wilfully determine to do so. He puts out his right hand and steals 3*s.* from the peer. God's love is not thereby diminished towards him—it is a venial act of theft. He puts out his left hand and steals the same sum of 3*s.* from the squire. He has earned to himself eternal hell fires, and his soul is dead—it is a mortal act of theft.

Once more,—a man is sitting in a railway carriage,—the temptation comes upon him, and though he is aware of the wickedness of the act he filches 2*s.* from his neighbour's pocket. Has he sinned mortally or venially? He does not know. If his neighbour was an absolutely rich man he sinned venially; if a moderately rich man he sinned mortally. Purgatory and everlasting death are in the balance.

Such are some of the absurdities which the introduction of

---

predicate; so we think that the theory of notable quantity in Theft should be perfected by the sum fixed being made relative to the income of the Thief as well as of the sufferer. We should then have a very pretty and ingenious puzzle, which might be represented in a diagram, something after the fashion of the 'Scheme of Opposition' in Aldrich. Perhaps some of the commentators on S. Alfonso (already he has several) will take advantage of this suggestion.

the Quantitative Principle into morals produces. The date of such introduction we need scarcely say is that period at which the vicious system of modern casuistry was in its strength. That there is a hint of it or approach to it in S. Augustine, and the moralists of the early Church, it would be an insult to them and to Christianity to suppose. Nay, it is not found in S. Thomas Aquinas. The names referred to in the passage quoted from Liguori will show its origin. The cause of its introduction is mainly twofold; first it may be traced to that spirit of defining, materializing, and making tangible, which has so unhappily pervaded Roman theology, doctrinal and moral; and next to a false idea that theft was only so far and to such degree sinful as it harmed our neighbour more or less. The fallacy which makes this latter notion plausible is easily exposed. It is true that the wilful harm done to our neighbour adds another sin to the sin of theft; but the sinfulness of the latter is already complete in its own kind as soon as a man has consciously and wilfully appropriated any sum, however small, knowing at the time that such appropriation was contrary to God's law. For example, God has written in our hearts the moral law of justice, 'Thou shalt not take that which is not thine to take;' and upon it has founded the positive law in His Word, 'Thou shalt not steal.' A man is conscious of these laws, and aware that he is bound by them. In the midst of this consciousness his eye lights upon something which he covets. The temptation is too strong for him, and he stretches out his hand and takes it. The sinfulness of the act is perfect, and yet not a thought has come into his mind of the harm, greater or less, done or not done, to his neighbour. So far as the sin of theft goes, it is wholly unimportant whether the thing which he coveted and appropriated was worth 2*d.* or 200*l.* It is true that if it were worth 200*l.*, and if that 200*l.* had been gathered together by a poor man in the sweat of his brow, and was his all, and the thief was conscious of this, another offence would be added to that of theft. Had the rich man in Nathan's parable taken the ewe lamb from another rich man, still he would have been guilty of a perfect sin of plunder, though he would not have added to it the further aggravation of cruelty and hard-heartedness. As it was, he was guilty first of seizing that which was not his, so transgressing the law of justice, and then, concomitantly with that sin, and by the same act, he was guilty of a host of other iniquities, by which he transgressed the laws of charity and humanity. We need not say that, without any additions or aggravations, theft and plunder are in themselves deadly sins.

So in murder. The formal sinfulness of murder consists in transgressing the law of God written in our hearts and in his

Word, 'Thou shalt not take another's life.' 'Thou shalt do no murder.' The sin would be a perfect sin of murder, although good rather than harm should come to the sufferer. The harm done to the sufferer adds another sinfulness to the already mortal sin of murder.

We shall be met by the question, What, then, is a boy a thief who eats a turnip as he is passing through a field? Certainly not, in virtue of that act taken abstractedly. What we have maintained all along is, that the guilt of the act depends upon the frame of mind of the agent. A merry boy who lightly takes an apple from an orchard is not blameless, but he is not guilty of a serious act of theft. But *if* he took that apple or that turnip not thoughtlessly, or because it was an allowed thing, but with a firm conviction all the time that it was forbidden by God, and that he was transgressing his law in doing so, then it would be a grave sin. But, says Lessius, 'for a theft to be mortal, it is 'necessary that the quantity of matter be considerable: and this 'is clear, for *it is not possible* that taking any little thing such as 'an apple or a penny, can be deadly guilt.'[1] We, on the other hand, lay down no abstract rule. In every case we say it depends upon the disposition of mind of the agent.

We now return to some more of the consequences of making *notabilis quantitas furti*, a condition of a mortal sin of theft.

'Lessius, Trulenchius, and Villalobos, say, that in separate small thefts twice as much is needed for grave matter, *i.e.* if 1*s.* 8*d.* is grave matter of itself, 3*s.* 4*d.* is required for grave matter by small thefts. Holzmann requires the same quantity, if these petty larcenies are committed on different persons, and if they take place at considerable intervals, he requires three times as much. To us, however, it seems more fair, as others quoted by Elbel say, to hold that if the petty larcenies are committed on the same person at intervals, or on different persons at the same time, then as much, and half as much again, *i.e.* 2*s.* 6*d.*, is requisite and enough for grave matter. But if both these things concur, namely, if they are committed on different persons and at different times, I think twice as much is needed, *i.e.* 3*s.* 4*d.* This however is to be understood with Lessius and Lugo, provided thefts are not purposely made in portions, and provided that there is not a long interval between the thefts. Layman, Bonacina, Lugo, &c. add, that petty larcenies do not coalesce if they are committed on different owners, and after a long interval, such as a year. Nay, Sanchez, Decian, Roncaglia, Viva, and Trulenchius, excuse from making restitution *sub gravi*, though the petty larcenies were committed on one owner, if there is an interval of a year. But Viva and Roncaglia reject the opinion of Filliuccius, Diana, Salaz, Vidal, Toletus, &c., who excuse from making restitution if fifteen days or a month have elapsed, as Navarrus in Sanchez admits: unless, excepts Viva, the matter is very small. Hence, I rather approve of Roncaglia's opinion, namely, that there must be at least an interval of two months, when the matter is, though not grave, yet very nearly grave.'—L. iv. 350.

[1] Lessius de Just. 2, 12, 13.

Thus we see that the category of Time, as well as the category of Quantity, is important in Rome's Theory of Theft. A disregard of a few days with respect to the period at which he commits his venial theft may perchance, precipitate a man beyond the range of Purgatory. The next extract will show that the category of Place is equally worthy of the regard of an Italian disciple.

'It is asked, Is it mortal to steal a little piece of a sacred relic? No one doubts that it is mortal in the Roman district, as Clement VIII. and Paul V. have excommunicated those who steal the very smallest relics against the will of the Rectors of the Churches. But it is not, (as Croix says "probably" with Sanchez, Bonacina, Castropalao, Diana, and Bardellus,) if, *outside the district*, a man steals some very little thing, the loss of which does not disfigure the relic or diminish its value—unless it be some remarkable or rare relic, as part of the Holy Cross, or of the Hairs of the Blessed Virgin Mary, &c.'—L. iv. 532.

'If a man on an occasion arising, only steals a little, whether from one or from more, not intending to acquire much himself, nor to do great harm to his neighbour by his several thefts, he does not sin gravely, nor do all these taken together constitute one mortal sin: but after a notable quantity has been reached, he may sin mortally by keeping it.'—L. iv. 533.

'It is enough for avoiding mortal sin, that only that little matter be restored which makes up the grave matter, as is more probably held by Sanchez, Lessius, Vasquez, Rebellus, Bonacina, &c., with Croix; against Medina, Lopez, Esparsa, &c.'—L. iv. 553.

'But if a man has the intention of gradually enriching himself by a number of little thefts, committed on one or many, or of doing great harm, he sins gravely in that intention; and though each act is only venial in itself, yet, as it subserves to such an intention, it is on the whole the commission of a mortal sin, because men do grave damage to the community, and that practice is very pernicious to human society, *e.g.* if a tailor purloin a little piece of cloth from different persons, or if tradesmen use too short measures, &c. (Mark here the proposition condemned by Innocent XI. 'No one is bound under penalty of mortal sin to restore what has been taken away by small thefts, however great the total may be.') Meantime they [*i.e.* the tailors, tradesmen, &c.] are sometimes excused from grave sin. 1. From what has been said above. 2. If they act as they do for the sake of indemnifying themselves, or because they would otherwise make no profits, or because they ought to raise their price, and then would not find customers. 3. If otherwise they have not means of supporting themselves and those belonging to them.'—L. iv. 533.

In the above extract we have an instance of the method so frequently, not to say constantly adopted, by our author, of laying down a good principle, and then eating out the heart of it by exceptions broad enough to cover every case. It will be seen that almost any tailor might justify himself in purloining little pieces of cloth, and almost any tradesman in using too short measures.

'If a man, after having taken enough to make grave matter, steals some other little thing again, Lugo, Croix, Sporer, Decian, &c., think it is a

mortal sin every time the pilfering takes place. But Lessius and the Salamanca Doctors, with Tapia and Diana, say that a light theft of this sort does not make a mortal sin, unless it amount afresh to another grave quantity. And this Bonacina rightly thinks "very probable." '—L. iv. 538.

Before bidding farewell to 'grave and small matter,' we must trace it in a few words into other branches of morals, and see how widely the Quantitative Principle extends, and what strange confusions it produces.

In oath-breaking:—

'It is certain that if you only fail in keeping a little of what you have sworn, it is not a grave sin; *e.g.* if you have sworn that you will not drink wine, you do not sin mortally by drinking a little, for then the smallness of matter is an excuse.'—L. iv. 173.

In working on Sundays:—

'What is gravity of matter in this? Some canonists quoted by Suarez fix one-third of the day for grave matter; but this opinion is commonly rejected. Others, again, with too great rigour, fix one hour. Others fix for grave matter two hours, as Roncaglia, Sanchez, Trulenchius, the Salamanca Doctors, Palao, Elbel, and Holzmann: and Sporer, Mazzotta, and Marchantius, call this the common opinion. Henno thinks so too, if the work is very servile, such as breaking stones or digging, but in other cases he requires three hours. But others, speaking generally, require for grave matter (and not without "probability") at least two, and rather more than two hours, as Viva, &c., with Tamburini, who says that this is now the received opinion in our age. Others, as Marchantius and Gobat, require three hours. Busembaum, likewise with Filliuccius, says that it is hard to condemn working for two or three hours as mortal sin. Croix agrees, and concludes that it is now the "more common, and more probable opinion," that it is not mortal, unless the work continues at least a good deal more than two hours, say two hours and a half.'—L. iv. 305.

In failing to hear Mass:—

'What omission is a grave sin? There are different opinions. The first says it is grave to omit from the beginning to the Epistle exclusively .... The second to the Epistle inclusively ... The third to the Gospel inclusively ... Although the Creed be omitted ... It is the "common" opinion that a man does not sin gravely who omits everything after the reception, nor even one who omits at the same time everything before the Epistle and everything after the reception.'—L. iv. 310.

In being at a distance from the Altar:—

'May Mass be heard by a man who looks at the altar out of his own house on the other side of the street? Sporer, Lugo, Decian, Gobat, &c. in Croix, say Yes; and this, not without "probability," is admitted by Mazzotta, Elbel, Escobar, and very many more, if the distance is small, because then he is, morally, sufficiently present. Lugo and Escobar say that a distance of sixty feet is not an obstacle, but Tamburini and Gobat do not allow that.'—L. iv. 312.

In fast-breaking, Pasqualigo holds half an ounce to be small matter. The Salamanca Doctors, on the contrary, confine it to

the eighth part of an ounce.[1] In omitting to say office, three Doctors think that half, or the third part, of a small 'hour' is notable matter, but this is denied by thirteen other Doctors; fourteen Doctors hold that anything less than the whole of a small hour is light matter; five Doctors maintain that the whole of the vespers on Easter-eve may on this ground be omitted without grave sin.[2] In failing to say Mass at the right hour, Azorius thinks twenty minutes to be grave matter; Layman half-an-hour; the more general opinion is anything under an hour.[3]

'In talking to nuns is smallness of matter allowed? De Alessandro thinks not; but the common opinion is on the other side. But authors differ in fixing what is small matter in such talking. Ciera thinks a few words; Merolla thinks ten words; Diana and Mazzotta the length of a *Miserere* and a little more; Quarti and Vericelli say a quarter of an hour.. Nor is Quarti's opinion condemned by Clement the IXth's Decree.. for the only opinion there condemned was that a quarter of an hour and half a quarter of an hour was small matter.'—L. vii. 236.

Such as these are the rules to which men are reduced when they ignore the true character of man's conscience, and forget that machines must be regulated in one way, and God's creatures, with God-given instincts of right and wrong, in another. We now pass on to the limited liberty granted to wives, children, and servants, to steal from their husbands, fathers, and masters. And let no one think that we are selecting an invidious term in employing the expression 'steal.' *Furari*, *surripere*, and *furta* are the words freely and innocently used by S. Alfonso. *Furari* we translate by *steal*, *surripere* by *purloin*, and *accipere* by *take*.

We have already seen that a wife may, without any fault, take money from her husband, to prevent him from spending it on bad objects; may carry his wine away, that he may not drink too much; and make away with his heretical books, that he may not read them. Further:

'A wife may give alms and gifts according to the custom of other women of her position and station, although her husband forbid her to give any alms, because custom allows her this right and her husband cannot deprive her of it. So says Lugo, "in common" with Molina, Lessius, Concina, Bonacina, Reginald, &c. in Diana, the last of whom, with Molina and ten others, teaches that, without letting her husband know anything about it, she may give the twentieth part of the income which he has, or of the profits which he makes, because it belongs to the respectability of her position to do so, and it would be unreasonable for her husband to be unwilling. (But Lugo, Sporer, Tamburini, and Croix, do not allow this when expressed so universally.) It follows also, that a wife may, with Abigail, give moderate alms to gain the conversion of her husband, or that God

[1] L. iv. 1029. [2] L. v. 147. [3] L. vi. 346.

may not punish him. Vasquez, Bonacina, Reginald, and ten others; against Concina.'—L. iv. 540.

'A wife commits no sin in secretly subtracting (*subducendo*) some things; whether by way of compensation, if her husband is an expensive man (because then he wrongs the wife by wasting her share,) or for food, dress, and the other necessaries for herself and the household, which husbands often don't understand, and it would be of no use to ask them.'—L. iv. 541.

'If a wife's father, mother, or children by another marriage are poor, so as to be living wretchedly according to their station, and her husband will not help them, she may supply them out of her own goods, or, as well, out of the common goods (provided that after her husband's death she reckons the sum spent to her own share,) because she is bound by the law of nature to keep them, and her husband to allow her to do so. Navarrus, Palao, Lessius, Diana. The latter extends this right to the support of brothers and sisters, which Lessius and Trulenchius also think "probable," with Lugo, Molina, Sanchez, &c.'—L. iv. 542.

We will exemplify this case. A gentleman, has, we will say, 20,000*l.* a year. He marries a wife, who is, or becomes, a faithful adherent of Rome, and consequently, thenceforth, has her conduct governed, through her Director, by S. Alfonso de' Liguori's Theory of Morals. Now, if the gentleman were given to racing and to drinking, we do not think that the best method of reclaiming him would be for his wife to lay hands on his money, in order to prevent him from spending it to his own harm or disadvantage. This, however, she might do if she liked (L. iv. 519). But we will not suppose him addicted to such pursuits. We will picture him to ourselves as a high-bred English gentleman. First then, he must look after his library, for any books which are placed upon the Index are in danger (L. iv. 519). And next he must make up his mind to various other losses, small and great, and all of them taking place in a mysterious and underhand manner, for his lady does not exercise her privileges openly.

Her great right, with which we will begin, is 1000*l.* per annum, to be taken from her husband's goods, without his knowledge, and bestowed in what is generally called charity, *i.e.* pious works pointed out by her Director. This 1000*l.* a-year must not be supposed to be her allowance from her husband, or property belonging to herself (which Liguori sets apart under the head of *dotalia* and *paraphernalia*): it is five per cent. on 'her husband's annual income,' and she is to get it, and give it away—this is the point to which we call especial attention—without her husband knowing anything about it—*inscio marito*. If she should be asked any troublesome questions, or if her conscience should become uneasy, the questions are answered and her conscience is quieted by the argument, that it would not be respectable and befitting her station if she did not give away 1000*l.* year in charity; and so, if her husband were unwilling that

she should do so, it would be unreasonable in him; and according to the very definition of theft, if the owner is unreasonable in his dislike at having his goods taken away, there can be no stealing—*Hoc pertinet ad decentiam statûs, et maritus irrationabiliter est invitus . . . Furtum est occulta et injusta rei alienæ ablatio, invito* rationabiliter *domino.* And how is this 1000*l.* a-year to be spent?—In alms and gifts. One special method of almsgiving is suggested 'to gain her husband's conversion, or that God will not punish him,' *i.e.* Masses for his conversion and for his soul. We doubt if the kind purpose here displayed would soften the loss of the 1000*l.* to the husband. We are not sure, indeed, whether the sum spent on Masses, with this object, is not an additional 'gift' exclusive of the 1000*l.*; at all events but a part of the latter could well be spent in it. The price of Masses differs in different countries, and for different classes; the usual price advertised in the *Esperanza*, and other Spanish newspapers, is 2*s.* In Florence we found the general charge to be two pauls; and in the South of Italy the lowest price is a carlino, or 5*d.* In each place a tariff is to be laid down, says Liguori, by the Ordinary. However high it should be fixed, yet it could not swallow up any considerable part of the 1000*l.* per annum; though we doubt not that a priest might thus find sufficient support to maintain him while occupied in converting his patroness's husband's tenants—and then there is the Chapel to be built. In one way or another the whole of this 1000*l.* is to be given away every year.

The next thing which the wife has to do is to make up her mind whether her husband is more expensive and wasteful than he ought to be; if she determines that he is, she may 'secretly subtract some things' in order to make compensation to herself for the injury which she is told is thus done to her.

Thirdly, she may 'secretly subtract some things' for food, dress, and household necessaries, which her husband would not allow her if she asked him; for husbands don't understand those things.

Fourthly, we must suppose that her father and mother are alive, that she has four or five brothers and sisters, and some children of her own by a previous marriage. Some reverses have fallen upon them, and they are no longer able to live in the style of gentlemen and ladies, as they have been used to do. She goes to her husband and asks him to help them. The husband, feeling perhaps the loss of the 1000*l.* and the other 'subtractions,' refuses, *non vult succurrere.* Then says Liguori, in his *Homo Apostolicus*, 'She may take something from the goods 'which belong to them both in common, or indeed from those 'which belong especially to her husband—enough for them to

'live according to their station—although her husband is repug-'nant to it, for his repugnance is irrational.' This will be another very serious item in the husband's expenses: seven or eight persons cannot be supported in the station of gentlemen and ladies for nothing. We think it must be put down at another 1000*l.* per annum.

On the other hand, she must cook the dinner and sweep the house, if her husband tells her, according to the opinion of some Doctors. 'Is a noble wife bound to fulfil menial offices at her 'husband's command, such as cooking the dinner and sweeping 'the house? Angelus, Tiraquellus, &c. say she must.' Others, however, are of a different opinion, and make the consolatory remark, that if the wife did such works she might compensate herself, *i.e.* take as much more of her husband's goods as would serve for a cook's or housemaid's wages. 'Sanchez, the Sala-'manca Doctors, with Sylvius, Garcias, Fagundez, &c., "with 'greater probability," say she need not, because the wife is 'a companion, and therefore is not bound to perform the works 'of a servant, which would be a disgrace to her; and if she 'did perform them herself, she might make compensation to 'herself, as they say.'[1]

Moreover, the husband 'may sometimes chastise moderately 'with words, and on grave cause with moderate blows, if he has 'regard for her condition and station,' but must not 'beat her 'heavily.'[2] It appears too that, on the authority of Sanchez, Surdus, &c., he may starve her if her dowry has not been paid: the more general opinion however would only justify him in maintaining her in the same style in which he keeps his servants.

'Is the husband bound to keep or support (*alere*) his wife if her dowry has not been paid? The Doctors in common say No, if it is the fault of the promiser that it has not been paid. So Sanchez, Bonacina, Bossius, the Salamanca Doctors, Fagundez, Trulenchius and others, saying that the object of the dowry is that the husband may keep his wife with it. Except, however, 1, if the husband married without a dowry being promised, and, 2, if the wife pays obedience to her husband, for then he is at least bound to keep her like a servant. So say the Salamanca Doctors, with Abbas, Lupo, &c., quoted by Sanchez. Sanchez, however, with Surdus and others, does not allow the second exception, because (as he says) the wife is bound to pay her husband both a dowry and obedience, and therefore it is not necessary for him to maintain her if she only pays obedience. But I rather adhere to the opposite opinion, because the law of nature itself teaches you to keep one who occupies himself in being your servant.'—L. vi. 939.

Still he must take care how he behaves, for, since the conversion of his wife, the continuance of his marriage is entirely at

[1] L. iv. 352. [2] L. iv. 356.

the mercy of the neighbouring Roman Catholic Bishop—it may be, the very Director who arranges how the 1,000*l.* shall be bestowed in works of piety. It is no longer lawful for his wife to live with him except by the dispensation of the Bishop. The second of the four causes which justify divorce, *quoad vinculum* in Roman Theology, is the fact of one of the two being converted to the faith. On this head a question is asked, 'If the 'unbeliever will not be converted, but still wishes to live peace-'ably without wrong towards the Creator, may the faithful one 'separate from him not only *quoad torum* but also *quoad vincu-'lum?*'[1] To this three answers are given. The first absolutely in the negative, which is held by S. Paul; the second absolutely in the affirmative, which is held by Bellarmine:

'The third is the "more common and more probable" opinion, held by Sanchez, Concina, Pontius, Tournely, and others, which says that *in old days* the believing wife[2] might not go away from her husband and proceed to another marriage, unless there were danger of her perversion, because there was no cause for her leaving her unbelieving husband, for very many unbelievers were converted to the faith by miracles, which were then much more commonly worked by the faithful; *but now-a-days*, when so great a frequency of miracles has ceased, it is made unlawful to live with an unbelieving husband by the received custom of the Church, which has been introduced from experience having taught that there is no little risk of perversion from living with an unbeliever—except the Bishop gives a dispensation for living with him from probable hope of his conversion. We must however mark with S. Thomas, Concina and Petrocorensis, that the marriage is not broken till the believer has left her husband and proceeded to another marriage. And also that before the believing one contracts another marriage, she ought to warn the unbelieving one, to see if he will be converted to the faith, as Gregory XIII. and S. Pius V. commanded. Sanchez however says that this need not be done if it is certain that the unbeliever is obstinate or if he is very far off. Croix notices that in case the unbelieving one cannot be warned, the Pontiff's dispensation is required, as, he says, the aforesaid Gregory XIII. has commanded.'—L. vi. 957.

Besides the four methods of divorce *quoad vinculum*—by death—by the conversion of one of the two—by entering a monastery within two months after marriage, and before consummation—by Papal dispensation under certain circumstances;—

[1] It may suggest itself to our readers that the word *infidelis*, 'unbeliever,' here used, can mean only the heathen, and not be applicable to those whom Rome calls heretics as well. This however is not so. For not to mention that the contradictory to *infidelis* here employed is not *Christianus*, but *Catholicus*, and to put out of sight the fact that the Rev. F. W. Faber, in his Essay on Missions, has declared for himself and his co-religionists that it is a point of sound theology to hold all Englishmen not in communion with Rome, and all Protestants, to be 'infidels,' we have S. Alfonso's own definition of what he means by *infidelis*. '*Infidelitas* or unbelief,' he says, 'is of three kinds. The first *negative*, of men who have never heard anything about the faith.... The second *contrary*, of those who despise or obstinately contradict the faith when it has been sufficiently brought before them, *as the heretics*. The third *privative*.... Unbelief termed *contrary* is also threefold, viz. Paganism .... Judaism .... Heresy.'—L. iii. 17.

[2] Or 'husband,' throughout.

there are also six methods of divorce, *quoad torum*. The first is that which proceeds on our Lord's precept, unless it be for fornication.' The second is ill-treatment, which Liguori says has been introduced by the authority of the Church.[1] The third is 'if one entices the other to sin, for example, solicits her 'to become a heretic, to deal in witchcraft, &c.: for then the 'innocent one is allowed, nay is bound to separate if the danger 'is serious.'[2] The fourth is a contagious disease, like leprosy.[3] The fifth, heresy or apostasy, arising after marriage, for 'a wife 'may go away from an heretical husband, though his heresy is 'secret, nay, she is bound to do so, if she is in danger of being 'perverted.'[4] The sixth is mutual consent.[5]

Liguori, in qualifying a liberty of dispensation with regard to marriage, allowed to the Pope by Busembaum, Sanchez, Bellarmine, Navarrus, the Salamanca Doctors, Cajetan, Vasquez, Bonacina, Rebellus, Becanus, &c., expresses a fear that if it were allowed, few marriages could stand firm.[6] We think that without this liberty, there are few which might not be overthrown by the ten methods of divorce enumerated above; the more as

---

[1] L. vi. 970. [2] L. vi 973. [3] L. vi. 973.

[4] L. vi. 794. A marriage, however, originally contracted with a 'heretic,' is valid, though illicit. 'To contract a marriage with a heretic, though it is a thing unlawful in itself, and is held to be a mortal sin in Spain and Italy, is yet probably allowable, owing to the authority of grave doctors, in Germany, if there is a grave cause for it, with a *salvo* however for natural law, and provided that there is no danger either to the contracting party or to the children; settlements ought to be made at the beginning with regard to the children, that they should be brought up as Catholics.'—L. iii. 19. And again, 'Marriage with heretics is, generally speaking, forbidden by the Church, but it is very probable that where heretics and Catholics live mixed together, as in Germany, Poland, &c., it is allowable from received and tolerated custom to marry heretics, provided that, 1, the Catholic may freely remain in the faith; 2, there is no danger of perversion; 3, the children are allowed to be brought up as Catholics; 4, it is not easy to find a partner among Catholics. But if any one of these conditions is wanting, it is not allowable; as Croix rightly says.'—L. vi. 56. We find too that 'His Holiness Pope Benedict XIV. grieves over Catholics who do not from their soul abhor those detestable marriages which holy mother Church has always condemned.'—L. vi. 1044.

[5] L. vi. 975.

[6] 'But the second opinion says Yes, [*i.e.* that the Pope can free *a vinculo*, in the case of a marriage celebrated but not consummated,] and is held by Busembaum, Sanchez, Bellarmine, Navarrus, the Salamanca Doctors, Cajetan, Vasquez, Concina, Bonacina, Rebellus, Becanus, &c., on the grounds that Pontiffs have made it customary by very often dispensing after a marriage has been celebrated, as Navarrus and Cajetan declare of their own knowledge, and also because the Chief Pontiff, as Christ's Vicar entrusted with the government of the Church, may very well dispense, when he has a good reason, even in things which are *de jure divino*, and concern human actions. And, as the afore-named authors say, a good reason would be *impotentia superveniens*, or scandal impending, or barrenness lately discovered, when the public good requires that children should be born. They add also disparity of condition, a contagious disease, dissensions being foreseen, and mutual consent, but Concina does not allow these last four reasons, and he is right, at least unless the necessity of the public good require their being acted on: for otherwise if they were admitted, few marriages could stand firm.'—L. vi. 959. This, it will be observed, is *quoad vinculum*, not only *quoad torum*.

we find that there are twenty-one impediments of marriage, six only of which make it unlawful, but still valid; while the other fifteen make it absolutely null, *although it has been celebrated.*[1]

We now proceed to the right of sons in stealing from their fathers:—

'Salaz says, in Croix, that a son's theft of 5*l.* or 7*l.* 10*s.* is not grave, if his father has 375*l.* a-year; and Lugo does not find fault with this statement, if the father is not close, and if the son is grown up, and takes it for honest purposes. Lessius, Navarrus, and Filliuccius in Sporer, say that a son does not sin gravely in stealing 10*s.* or 15*s.* from a rich father. Bannez says, that for a grave theft by the son of a very rich father, at least 12*l.* 10*s.* is required; but Lugo and La Croix reject this, unless it were the son of a *principe*. Holzmann agrees in this; he says, too, that it is not grave to take 2*l.* 10*s.* from a very rich father. Navarrus, Soto, Layman, &c., allow that if a son is engaged in study, and his father sends him 25*l.*, the son may spend 1*l.* 5*s.* in honest recreations, on the presumed consent of his father.'—L. iv. 543.

'If the son, say, of a tradesman or an innkeeper, manages his father's goods, he may require his father to give him a salary as large as he would give to a man who was no relation; and if he cannot get it, or does not venture to ask for it, he may take it clandestinely. So, "with probability," Layman, Diana.'—*Ibid.*

Some of the other duties of parents and sons towards each other are given in the few next extracts:—

'Parents sin gravely if, without good reason, they expose their offspring in a hospital or in public places: but the child's being illegitimate is a good reason, as Layman, Diana, Henriquez, and the Salamanca Doctors say. . . . Hospitals of this kind are instituted for the assistance not only of the poor, but also of the rich in danger of disgrace; for then they are used to procure abortion or kill their child to avoid loss of character. Now, this is the evil which hospitals are intended to meet; nay, I say, they are erected rather for spurious children than for the poor, for the purpose of freeing the former from the danger of death, eternal and temporal, which they would be likely to undergo, through fear of disgrace, if the parents had to keep them of their own cost.'—L. iv. 336, 656.

'A father must support both his legitimate and illegitimate children. . . . And ecclesiastics may keep their spurious children out of their clerical revenue.'—L. iv. 336.

'A son sins gravely against reverence, if he despises his parents for being poor, and will not acknowledge them. But still, if he only outwardly dissembles his knowledge of them, and will not have them with him, for good

---

[1] I. Ecclesiæ vetitum, II. necnon tempus feriarum,
III. Atque Catechismus, IV. Crimen, V. Sponsalia, VI. Votum,
Impediunt fieri, permittunt facta teneri.
I. Error, II. Conditio, III Votum, IV. Cognatio, V. Crimen,
VI. Cultûs disparitas, VII. Vis, VIII. Ordo, IX. Ligamen, X. Honestas,
XI. Ætas, XII. Affinis, XIII. Si clandestinus, XIV. et Impos,
XV. Raptave sit mulier nec parti reddita tutæ,
Hæc socianda vetant connubia, *facta reractant.*—L. vi. 982, 1008.

reason, Bonacina excuses him from grave sin so that he provides them with necessaries, because it is not reasonable for them to be unwilling that he should so act. Hence, "with probability," Azorius, Navarrus, Toletus, and Trulenchius excuse the son who does this, from mortal sin, in the following cases:—1. If he would suffer grave harm. 2. If his parents bear the stigma of a disgraceful crime. 3. If he only outwardly dissembles, and has not inward contempt, because then the parents themselves are not supposed to be gravely or reasonably unwilling.'—L. iv. 334.

'Sporer says, absolutely, that if a son curses his parents, or mocks at them, he is not excused from mortal sin, whether he does it in their presence or their absence. I do not know how this author, who is moderate enough in his other opinions, and perhaps sometimes over-indulgent, could make this assertion so absolutely; for, as he confesses himself, and every one teaches, no harm is done to reverence or respect but by insult offered in a man's presence, or if it be in his absence, with the purpose of its coming to his knowledge. And besides, there is the argument which is used by very many grave Doctors, who say that sacrilege is not committed, and a Church is not polluted, by fornication in it, provided it be committed secretly, on the grounds which Coninchius gives, that due respect to a Church, like character, consists in the opinion of men; consequently, as men do not lose their character unless their crimes are made public, so the reverence of a holy place is not violated unless the crime is publicly known. However it may be about this opinion, (which is "quite probable," as the Salamanca Doctors say, though the opposite appears to me "more probable," because of the irreverence to God, who is specially present in a Church, and sees everything which is secret,) what I am concerned with is the reason which they bring forward; viz. that no harm is done to reverence but by an open manifestation of insult. How then can a son sin gravely when he curses his father without his knowing it, or mocks at him behind his back, inasmuch as, in that case, there is neither insult nor irreverence? And I think that the same is to be said, even though he does this before others. Still I do not deny that there is in it a sort of slight which is opposed to due filial reverence, and a special *malitia contra pietatem continentem*, but it does not reach to mortal sin, except in case the son cursed them with malevolent meaning, or with great contempt; for example, if he should curse them in the presence of others, with the purpose of their carrying it to his parents, or supposing they would carry it.

'Now Viva, Elbel, Tamburini, Mazzotta, Bonacina, and others, say that a son sins gravely in cursing his parents, whether they are alive or dead. But the afore-named authors, with somewhat too great inconsiderateness, do not explain whether they speak of curses uttered with malevolent meaning or not. And yet it must be altogether understood that he does not sin gravely if he curses them without such design. And indeed Navarrus and Filliuccius, whom Bonacina cites for his doctrine, do understand it so; for Navarrus says that a son sins who curses his parent, *and means it*, whether his parent is dead or alive; but if he only curses them with his tongue, it is no more than a venial offence. And this Filliuccius confirms in almost the same words.'—L. iv. 334.

To return to the case of the gentleman whose wife we have represented as acting upon the approved principles of Roman moral theology, and see how he would fare with his children.

The tariff by which sons are to steal from their fathers is as follows:—

	£	*s.*	*d.*
The son of a rich nobleman may venially steal .	12	10	0
The son of a man worth 375*l.* a year from 5*l.* to	7	10	0
The son of a very rich man	2	10	0
The son of a rich man from 10*s.* to	0	15	0

This does not seem a very fair scale of prices, but we must take it as it stands.

An English gentleman with 20,000*l.* per annum, whether noble or not, is, we need scarcely say, more than equal in position to an Italian *principe*. The sum therefore which each of his sons may steal from him without grave sin is 12*l.* 10*s.*, and the interval which we have seen must elapse between two acts of venial theft is two months. The whole sum, therefore, which each son may venially steal, in the course of the year, is 75*l.* If he has six or seven sons this will take away another 500*l.* per annum from his income, besides what is more precious than gold or silver, what cannot be counted by money, but which a father's feelings could appreciate and a Christian's heart weep over.

But the father is now growing old, and he hands over the management of his estates to his eldest son. The right of claiming a salary, in such a case, is not confined to the sons of tradesmen and innkeepers, as might appear from the passage which we have extracted above. Any son may do so according to Navarrus, Lessius, Angelus, Lopez, Layman, and Busembaum, though Molina, Sanchez, and Croix think otherwise. Cardinal de Lugo and Liguori make a distinction, and say that the profits which he makes belong to his father,[1] but that if the trouble to which he is put is very great, he may quite well ask for a salary. And according to the same Doctors, 'The son is not 'to be presumed to have given up his claim to his salary, if from 'reverence to his father he refuses to *ask* for it: in that case 'however he must subtract what he costs his father for his 'keep.'[2] The euphemistic method of expression here used is highly praiseworthy, but, as we have seen, it is in the analogous case of the tradesman's son expressed more plainly—*potest clam accipere*—'he may take it clandestinely.' Here therefore is the mysterious loss of several more hundreds to the gentleman whose unhappy fortunes we have been tracing.

The son's right of pretending not to know his father, and refusing openly to acknowledge him, would not be called into

[1] This, however, is only if he acts in his father's name; 'but,' say Lugo and Molina, 'the profits belong to *him* if he engages in business in his own name, suppose that he has stolen the money from his father, or the money was resting idle in his father's hands.'—Theol. Mor. l. iv. 488. 3.

[2] L. iv. 488. 3.

exercise in the present case: but the privilege of cursing him might. We have seen that S. Alfonso becomes almost eloquent in maintaining that it is only venial in him, provided he curses him behind his back: he may do it before other people, so that he does not do it with the purpose of its getting round to his father's ears. And, besides, it is not grave sin, unless he intends the imprecation which he utters really to take effect; otherwise, *si oret enus tantum maledixerit*, it is also venial. In like manner, in another passage, we are told that to curse the devil is seldom a mortal, and not often even a venial, sin.[1] That to use the words *Blood of God! Body of God!* in anger towards man, but without direct indignation against God, is not blasphemous[2]—that *God's Death! God's Wounds!* similarly used, and without scandal or circumstances which imply contempt, are serious instances of venial sins[3]—that it is only venial to utter an imprecation on a man, '*The devil seize you!*' so that it was not meant.[4] A long dissertation is introduced to prove that cursing the dead is not mortal, and Liguori utters a most earnest ejaculation 'that all Confessors and Preachers would anxiously take care to 'instruct rude people on that point!'[5] How soon this privilege of venially cursing their parents is allowed to children does not appear. In the *Praxis Confessarii*, the Confessor is desired to use the utmost affection and the sweetest manners possible to boys—*modos suaviores quantum fieri potest*—and then, after their confession, to inquire—1. Whether they have omitted telling anything from shame. 2. Whether they have blasphemed against the Saints or Saints' Days, or taken a lying oath.[6] 3. Whether they have omitted to hear Mass on festivals. 4. Whether they have been disobedient to their parents, or shewn irreverence towards them, by mocking at them, or making long noses at them, or uttering abusive words and imprecations in their presence.[7] And it seems that for sons to call their parents to their faces drunkards, beasts, fools, robbers, wizards, scoundrels, is mortal; but that calling them old fellows, ignorants, stupids, &c., may be venial.[8]

The son, on the other hand, must recollect that he sins gravely 'if, without good reason, such as inequality of birth, ill-health,

[1] L. iv. 129. [2] L. iv. 124. [3] L. iv. 128. [4] L. iv. 131. [5] L. iv. 130.

[6] Not, it will be observed, whether they have told a lie, but *an juraverint cum mendacio*.

[7] Prax. Conf. cap. vii. 90.

[8] Prax. Conf. cap. ii. 34. Another piece of advice in thus sweetly dealing with boys is observable; 'Let the Confessor, too, take the greatest care to insinuate into boys' minds devotion towards the Mother of God, (*curet magnoperè pueris insinuare devotionem erga Deiparam*) and get them to recite the Rosary every day, and the *Ave* three times morning and evening, always adding this prayer, "My mother, free me from mortal sin!"'—Cap. vii. 91. Rome knows how to make use of the waxen youth of boys, and does make use of it unscrupulously.

'ugliness, stupidity, immorality, he will not marry the wife that 'his parent wishes, especially if quarrels would be so lulled, or 'the parents' necessities lightened."[1] In case, however, that he wishes to enter Holy Orders, or to go into a Monastery, he is not to be so careful of their wishes, for, 'if he sees that his 'parents will unjustly hinder him, he will act most wisely by 'concealing the matter from them, and performing the divine 'will.'[2] 'Relatives must be altogether removed from a discus-'sion on a religious vocation, says S. Thomas, for on that matter 'relations are not friends but enemies.'[3]

Our view of a Liguorian household must now conduct us to the kitchen department.

'Servants commit no sin if their master refuses them their just keep or wages, and they make secret compensation to themselves, provided that there is no other way of getting it, and they do not take more than is owed, and there is no fear of scandal or other grave discomfort.'—L. iv. 349.

'In the same way Navarrus and Lessius teach that they may make themselves compensation out of their master's goods, if it cannot be otherwise obtained, for services which they have performed without being bound to do so, if they did them, not *gratis* and liberally, but intending to be paid.'—*Ibid.*

'May a servant who works without any settled wages ask for or secretly purloin (*occulte surripere*) his just pay, at least the lowest which is customary? *Distingue.* If it is the master's custom to pay servants like him, he may: not otherwise, when, for example, noblemen or bishops are asked to take boys into their household; for in that case it is enough for the master to give them board, clothing, and lodging, such being the custom.' —L. iv. 348.

'May a servant, more than three years after he has left his master, ask for his salary and secretly make compensation to himself? Yes, say Sanchez, the Salamanca Doctors, Molina, Fagundez, Villalobos, and others.'—L. iv. 347.

'A man does not steal if he takes by way of just compensation, and cannot otherwise get what is due to him; *e.g.* if a servant cannot otherwise obtain just wages, or has been unfairly induced to undertake the place for an unfair price.'—L. iv. 521.

'But may a servant being himself quite sure of the justice of his payment make himself this compensation of his own private judgment? Croix, Cardenas, and Viva say No, professing that no servant, nor any one else employed for money, ought to make himself compensation, except upon the "most common judgment" of men who are skilled, or of a man very learned and engaged on Morality; and so they say that the judgment of a Confessor of but ordinary learning is not enough. But the Salamanca Doctors say, that a servant may, of his own private judgment, make himself compensation for his work, if his judgment is clear that he deserves higher pay. And this appears "quite probable" to me and other learned moderns, if the servant or person employed is a prudent man, cautious (*timoratus*), and really fit to judge right, and is quite sure of the justice of the compen-

[1] L. iv. 335. [2] L. iv. 355. [3] Hom. Apost. xiii. 24.

sation without any danger of hallucination. But this is very seldom the case. And the 37th proposition condemned by Innocent XI. is no obstacle, for that proposition was rightly condemned because it spoke in too general terms.'—L. iv. 524.

Once again we find Innocent XI. attempting to put a stop to all this, and once more we find him foiled in his Jansenism.

'Mark here,' says Liguori, 'the proposition condemned by Innocent XI., which said "Domestic men-servants and maid-servants may secretly pilfer from their masters, to make compensation to themselves for their work, which they think is more than they need do for the wages which they receive."'—L. iv. 522.

Observe, now, the way in which the Jansenistical Pope's condemnation is treated by the Casuists:

'The Salamanca Doctors, and others, speaking of this condemned proposition, say, 1. That a servant can *not* afterwards make himself compensation if he makes his bargain freely with his master for a lower sum, without necessity; *but* that he is not forbidden to do so, if he agrees on wages considerably less than are just, from necessity; namely, to lighten his own distress. The reason is that Pontifical decrees do not mean to bind a servant contrary to justice.'—L. iv. 522.

Do these writers really believe in the authority which, when it suits them, they are pleased to make so much of, and which it is an almost ruled point of faith to call infallible?[1] It cannot be. See the way in which they argue here. If the Papal decree meant what it clearly does mean, it would be unjust: therefore it *cannot* mean what it clearly does mean: therefore it *does not* mean what it clearly does mean: therefore it means something different from what it clearly does mean. What is it that it does mean? *We* will interpret it by introducing proper limitations and qualifications, and we are the Salamanca Doctors, and Viva, Lessius, Suarez, Molina, &c. with Liguori. Thus they appeal from infallibility to themselves.[2] La Croix, however, will not go with his brethren:

[1] 'About the infallibility of the Pope there are more opinions than one. The first is that of Luther and Calvin, who heretically teach that the Pope *is fallible*, though he speaks as universal doctor and even with a council. The second, which Albert Pighius maintains, is the direct contrary to this, that the Pope *cannot err* though speaking in his private capacity. The third is that of some who teach that the Pope *is fallible without a council*. This opinion was embraced by the Gallican clergy in 1682. . . . The fourth, which is the "common opinion," and the one to which we subscribe, is that though the Roman Pontiff, as an individual, or a private doctor, can err (just as he is also fallible in questions of mere fact, which chiefly depend on human testimony); yet when the Pope speaks as the universal doctor, defining *ex cathedrâ*, that is, from the supreme power given to Peter of teaching the Church, then we say that he is altogether *infallible* in deciding controversies of faith and morals. . . The Doctors infer that this opinion of ours is at least next to being a matter of faith, and the contrary, as Bellarmine says, seems altogether erroneous, and next to being heresy. . . Our doctrine that the dogmatic decrees of the Pontiff are infallible. . . Our opinion of the infallibility of the Pontifical definitions.'—Dissertatio de Rom. Pont. Auctor. Theol. Mor. l. i. 110.

[2] There are fifteen canons, or rules how to make use of Pontifical decrees, ap-

'Croix says that a servant may not purloin anything at all after he has made a bargain, because then he has given up his right; but it is answered that when a servant is forced by his poverty to make such terms, he does not give up his right voluntarily, but upon compulsion; and so *his* poverty cannot excuse the master from not paying at least the lowest wages. But when a servant is compelled by necessity to agree for a small sum, he may make himself compensation up to the lowest sum usual. So says Viva, with Lessius, Suarez, Molina. Decian, and others, with (as he says) the "most common opinion." This, however, does not hold if the master has already *justly* found other servants for the same small sum, or if the servant offered himself, and the master was only employing him through kindness, on account of his indigence.' L. iv. 522.

Croix is thus silenced: but the whole of its force has not yet been extracted from Innocent's decree; so there is a second dictum of the *Salmanticences* respecting it:

'The Salamanca Doctors say, 2. That if a servant, of his own free choice, does more than his work, he may *not* purloin anything, because he is then supposed to give his labour for the sake of ingratiating himself with his master; *but* he may purloin if he does more than his work by his master's wish, whether expressed or tacit, for then the rule is to be observed that the labourer is worthy of his hire. So the Salamanca Doctors, Molina, Soto, Villalobos, Navarrus, Diana, Fagundez, Bassæus, Corrella, Filguera, Torrecilla, Lastra, and Hozes; and Croix agrees.'—L. iv. 523.

The country gentleman of 20,000*l.* a-year has, as we have seen, suffered serious losses in the character of husband and father. Now he must make up his mind to undergo many more in his character of master. It is true they will not be individually so large in amount, but there will be many more of them, for he doubtless has a large establishment. Nor is the privilege of compensation confined to household servants; it is allowed to every one employed by him on his estates or in his business—*quicunque alius mercenarius.* Here, too, there is not even the check of purloining being venial sin, which in the case

---

pended to the *Theologia.* The example given to illustrate the thirteenth is as follows:—Sixtus V. issued a bull named *Detestabilis*, and condemned the method of contract called *trinus contractus.* But 'Cardinal Toletus and Cardinal S. Severina, who were entrusted by Sixtus V. with the drawing up of the law or bull *Detestabilis*, told Father Stephen Tuccius, a Theologian of the Society of Jesus, that Sixtus did not wish any contracts to be forbidden by his law except what were unjust. Consequently all the contracts which were just before his law was passed, (and many say that the *trinus contractus* was so) were just after it, as the learned Comitolus writes in his Moral Replies, lib. iii. qu. 12. n. 3.'—Dissertatio de Rom. Pont. Decretis, vol. vi. p. 210. There is a mighty war waged in the fourth book of the *Theologia* about this *trine contract.* On one side there are three Popes, Sixtus V., Benedict XIV., and Pius V., supported by twelve Doctors; on the other side twenty-two Doctors, supported by the opinions of the universities and theological faculties of Cologne, Trèves, Alcalá, Salamanca, Ingoldstadt, Freiburg, and Mentz. The twenty-two Doctors and the seven Universities carry the day hollow against the three Popes and the twelve Doctors; and poor Sixtus gets treated with the utmost contumely, each Doctor having a better reason than the last for throwing overboard his *Bulla Detestabilis.*—L. iv. 908.

of the sons, at least, there was. We cannot venture to calculate the amount of loss which he will have to suffer, because we cannot tell the nature of his occupations, and consequently how many men and women he has in his employment. We will take the case of one from which a guess may be made with regard to the others. A footman has been hired for 25*l.* He considers this notably less than what is just, and that he ought to have 35*l.*, which in such a household as his master's is the very lowest sum which a footman of his qualifications ought to receive. However, if he had not taken the place he would have been very likely to have found a difficulty in getting another, and he was too poor to live without one; so he could not help it; he was forced to take what his master offered him, he accepted the terms, and held his tongue. But by having made this bargain with his master for 25*l.* he had not given up his claim to 35*l.* He determines that he will make up the other 10*l.* by secret compensation. But who is to be judge if he really deserves 35*l.* a year? It must be either a Moral Theologian or himself; and to know whether he may decide for himself, he is to ask himself two questions. Is he sure of the justice of the compensation without any risk of hallucination? Is he a prudent man, cautious, and really fit to judge right? He has no difficulty in answering these two questions in the affirmative, and now he is perfectly justified in secretly appropriating 10*l.*, so that he takes care to avoid scandal and annoyance in doing so. The case of John d'Alba is perfectly borne out.

We have also here found a key to an occurrence which took place to ourselves and a companion at Florence in the year 1849. After having stayed for some days at the hotel, we determined on taking lodgings for a fortnight. We accordingly examined some houses which were to be let, and after a time found one which would suit us in all respects. Being then in blissful ignorance of the theory of Compensation—(we had not then begun our studies of S. Alfonso)—we were agreeably surprised to find that the price was lower than that of the other apartments which we had been looking at. We took up our quarters in the lodgings, and were made sufficiently comfortable. At the end of the fortnight we looked over our clothes and other goods, which had not been kept under lock and key, preparatory to our departure. To our dismay we found very serious and considerable losses in the clothes department. We were led to make a vigorous investigation of the house, and from different odd corners, holes, shelves, and drawers, we drew forth several missing waistcoats, shirts, and other articles of dress: especially we recollect raising ourselves by the help of a chair to a lofty shelf, from the far recesses of which we extracted several pairs

of socks which we threw down from our elevation to our companion. Having recovered as much of our property as we were able, we summoned the *Padrone*, demanded the rest of our goods, and told him in pretty plain language, that he was a dishonest man. The *Padrone* was horror-struck; he vowed he had never *stolen* anything in his life, and burst into sobs at the imputation. Seeing that we were not melted, he hastily left the room, and sent in his wife. The lady's nerves were more overcome than her husband's. She burst into floods of tears—so many years she had let lodgings, and never, never before was such a charge brought against her house: she protested by all that was saintly that she had *stolen* nothing. 'Perjury added to 'theft,' said we grimly to each other in English: nor was the severity of our faces relaxed, except after she had declaimed for half-an-hour or so by an occasional yawn, till she left the room still vowing that nothing had been *stolen*. Now in our simplicity we thought that she and her husband were guilty of petty larceny and of lying to boot. But had we been acquainted with S. Alfonso de' Liguori's Moral Theology, we should have judged them less hardly. From the little facts which came under our notice, we drew the conclusion that they had stolen our goods; whereas we now see that the conclusion which we ought to have drawn was that they had good heads for arguing by analogy—a thing in itself admirable and praiseworthy. They knew from their attendance at the confessional that household servants might compensate themselves in the way explained above if they had wages lower than their services deserved, and they knew that tailors, tradesmen, &c. were justified in purloining little pieces of cloth, using short measures, &c. 'if they would otherwise make no profits, or if they ought to raise their price, and 'then would not find customers.' (L. iv. 533.) Being gifted with reasoning powers, they inferred that as they had let their apartments at a lower rate than their neighbours, and as they ought to have raised their price, but very likely would not, they thought, have then found lodgers, they were fairly entitled to make up their profits by secret compensation. This they accordingly did; and it was difficult for them perhaps to settle the amount of compensation due to them. It would depend upon the abstract value which they put upon their lodgings totally apart from their bargain with us. We believe that they must have placed a high price upon them in their own minds, for after all the recoveries which we succeeded in making, our Journal-book still relates the loss of many articles of dress which might have continued with us throughout our travels in Italy, had we known the Theory of Secret Compensation, and been accordingly upon

But further—to return to the country gentleman's household—as there is a large number of servants in the house, the footman's place is not very heavy. This being so, he does more than his regular work, more than he is bound to do by his place, and this he does, not *gratis* or liberally, but intending to be paid for it. Then say Navarrus and Lessius, he may secretly take so much more as he thinks will recompense him for this extra labour. And if his master has appeared to him to exhibit a tacit desire that he should perform these supererogatory tasks, it is the universal opinion of the Doctors that he may proportionately purloin, on the principle that the labourer is worthy of his hire. How much hire his labour is worth he again decides for himself, or his Director settles for him. Perhaps we may fix this at another 5*l.*, though we doubt if the footman would be so moderate.

He has still a further right of purloining:—

'Though servants sin gravely in carrying eatables and drinkables out of the house and selling them, they are more easily excused (in the same way that monks are) for what they consume themselves at home; for then the master or the prelate is often only unwilling with regard to the secret manner of taking, not with regard to the appropriation itself. Yet it might be feared that he would be unwilling if things extraordinary were taken.—Layman, Escobar, and Lessius. The latter teaches that very little thefts of servants out of eatables which are not generally locked up, do not unite so as to become grave matter, if what is stolen is not taken to sell, but only to eat. So too, Cajetan, Navarrus, Bannez, Moya, and Sanchez in Croix. But Sporer rightly does not admit this last point, if the quantity is large.'—L. iv. 545.

So, if they are not kept locked up, the footman may drink his master's champagne and claret—or, supposing him very conscientious, he may perhaps confine himself to the port and sherry; and all the eatables, from the store-room to the larder, are at the mercy of the respective servants who have to do with them. This again will be a serious expense to the master of the house, particularly, as in spite of Sporer, however much is thus consumed in the end, the small quantities stolen at several times cannot coalesce into one notable quantity, and so there can be no grave sin.[1]

---

[1] 'We have said in the First Book, and we shall say more at length in the Sixth Book, that if a Penitent has a probable opinion on his side he cannot be refused absolution; and this is "commonly" taught.' So if the confessor recommends Sporer's doctrine, the penitent has only to quote Lessius or Cajetan, and then he may *demand* absolution. 'After having confessed his sins the penitent has a definite right to absolution, and it may not be denied him, unless he is otherwise indisposed, and he cannot be called indisposed for not following the confessor's opinion, for it does not belong to the latter to reject opinions which other wise men approve of.'—L. iv. 669.

Alas for the dignity, the uprightness, the purity, the confidence of homes, when such principles as these come into vogue! We have been calculating the money losses of the master of the house; but we trust that our readers have seen that it has been in a sort of *εἰρωνεία* that we have confined ourselves to this point. What are money losses as compared to all the other far more precious losses which he would have to suffer? Where could be the husband's reposing trust in the assured affection of the wife of his bosom? Where could be the respectful and tender confidence between father and son? Where the guileless frankness between brother and sister? Where the unhesitating trust in the old servant's, or retainer's, honesty and faithfulness? They could not but wither and utterly perish. Englishmen do not sufficiently realise the blessings of an English home. Whether it be the Elizabethan mansion surrounded by its ancestral trees, or the humbler parsonage, or the old farm-house, or the cottage—*home and home relations* are essentially English. Nowhere else is found that union of liberty and restraint among the younger members, of combined respect and love towards the head of the house, of confidence and frankness among all. The English Church is essentially domestic. She strengthens the ties of home, sanctifies them, and works through them. Rome cuts away home influences in her love of centralization, and substitutes that of the Director. The husband, father, and master is no longer the head of the house, around which the thoughts and feelings of the family are grouped. An extraneous mind is the ruling power. He who ought to be the rightful authority feels that he is so no longer; there is a shadow between him and his; confidence is not given, and therefore he does not give it. He feels himself no longer the centre of the household. He knows not why, or, if he does know, his religious principles forbid him to apply a remedy,—he acquiesces and betakes himself to the Café. Such books as Michelet's 'Priests, Women, and Families'—embittered, maddened, frenzied, as they are—would not have been written without some cause.

Look at what a home ought to be, its confidence, its love, its reverence, and its dignity; and then look at the picture as drawn by Liguori, of a household free from all but venial sin,[1] —the wife pilfering from her husband, appropriating a large percentage of his income, and taking care that he should not find it out, keeping her relations out of his goods, in spite of his prohibition, secretly subtracting one thing and another

[1] We must again remind our readers that venial sins do not diminish God's love towards the agent, (Hom. Apost. iii. 66,) not though he determines to commit every venial sin that has been, is, or will be. (Theol. Mor. l. v. 12.)

thing, and being justified in all by her Director: childre stealing periodically, cursing and mocking at their parents b hind their backs; refusing to acknowledge or to recognise then if they are ashamed of them; taught to conceal their purpos of entering into Holy Orders, or the Monastic life, from the as from enemies, but, with a curious inconsistency, require though not absolutely bound, if they marry, to marry who their parents bid them: daughters, as we find from the sam authority, not allowed to be taught to read by a man, an scarcely by quite a little brother; not trusted to go to churc by themselves, or to stay long in church without their parent supervision; not allowed to receive more than one, or at most tw visits from their betrothed, and that for the most degrading of a reasons; and lastly, servants pilfering to recompense themselve for having too low wages; pilfering to recompense themselve for extra work which they do; pilfering all the eatables an drinkables which are not kept locked up. Who would no take refuge in Cafés and places of public resort, in which gentle men in foreign countries spend so much of their time, out o such a place as this, to which the name of *home* can be scarcel applied except in mockery? We will transcribe a few line of Mr. Martin Tupper's 'Proverbial Philosophy' by way o contrast:—

'My soul was sickened within me, so I sought the dwelling place of Joy
And I met it not in laughter; I found it not in wealth or power;
But I saw it in the pleasant home where religion smiled upon content,
And the satisfied ambition of the heart rejoiced in the favour of its God

* * * *

His love is pure and single, sincere, and knoweth not change;
For his manhood has been blessed with the pleasant choice of his youth
Behold his one beloved; she leaneth on his arm,
And he looketh on the years that are past to review the dawn of he affection.
Behold his little ones around him; they bask in the warmth of his smile
And infant innocence and joy lighten their happy faces;
He is holy, and they honour him; he is loving, and they love him:
He is consistent, and they esteem him; he is firm, and they fear him.
His friends are the excellent among men; and the bands of their friend ship are strong;
His house is the palace of peace: for the Prince of Peace is there.
As the wearied man to his couch, as the thoughtful man to his musings
Even so from the bustle of life he goeth to his well-ordered home.

* * * *

Man, the noble and intelligent, gladdeneth earth in beauty,
And woman's beauty sunneth him, as with a smile from heaven.'[1]

It may be thought that in picturing a Liguorian *home*, fre from all but venial sin in thieving and other respects, we have

[1] Proverbial Philosophy. On Joy and on Beauty.

made a somewhat unfair selection: our readers may think that the Church of Rome is notoriously unfavourable to the domestic relations, but that, at any rate, there would not be this permission to purloin, and this general laxity, in a state which she specially approves, and stamps with the title of the Religious life. We will make a few extracts on this point from the *Homo Apostolicus*:—

'It is doubted what quantity is grave for a monk to spend without leave? Some say that the same decision should be come to about the thefts of monks relatively to their monastery, as about the thefts of sons relatively to their parents. But Sanchez and Lugo are right in not admitting this, because sons are capable of possessing, and monks are not, and also Prelates are more unwilling in the case of their monks thieving than parents in that of their sons. The Doctors, however, say in common that a greater quantity is required for a monk's theft out of the monastery's goods to be grave, than in the case of other thefts. Opinions differ as to what it should be. Azorius, Navarrus, Castropalao, Sanchez, &c. fix on 1*l.* for grave matter, and rather more when the convent is rich; but this seems too indulgent. Soto and Rodriguez fix on 10*s.* as grave matter, and Croix counts this certain. Lugo thinks that 2*s.* 6*d.* is grave matter, and 3*s.* 4*d.* if the monastery is rich, even though the monk takes it from the portion assigned to his own use; but supposing he gave it to other monks belonging to the monastery, he extends the sum to 1*l.* 5*s.*, provided that it is not in actual money. Sanchez, Bonacina, the Salamanca Doctors, &c. allow that it is no grave fault to take eatables at many different times and in light matter, though afterwards they reach to grave matter, as Prelates are presumed not to be gravely unwilling, provided (as they limit it) that the damage done to the convent is not great, and the things are not precious.'—*Hom. Apost.* xiii. 10.

The principle is the same in the *Theologia Moralis*, but there is a difference in some particulars. The sums there fixed for grave matter are (1) 1*s.* 8*d.*; (2) more than 1*s.* 8*d.* provided that the convent be rich; (3) still more than that if it is not money, but clothes, books, &c.; (4) 2*s.* 11*d.* if taken from what is destined for himself; (5) or 3*s.* 4*d.*; (6) more than that if purloined for his own use; (7) 2*s.* 6*d.* if purloined from the common goods of the monastery, and given to strangers; (8) 3*s.* 4*d.* if taken *ex rebus quæ usu non consumuntur*, provided it is only done once or twice a-year; (9) or 3*s.* 9*d.*; (10) 10*s.*; (11) the same sum which sons are allowed to steal, 'for monks stealing what 'would in ordinary cases be grave matter, commit no sin against 'justice, but only against their vow of poverty, unless the theft 'causes grave damage to the monastery.' [illegible] from what is allowed for his use, and giv[illegible] or even 8*s.* 4*d.*; (14) more than [illegible] (15) still more than that if con[illegible] give to others. Thefts of small [illegible] become grave if there is a lon[illegible] 'long interval' is interpreted

Salamanca Doctors, Filliuccius, Diana, Garcias, and Antony of the Holy Ghost, to mean a month.[1]

And as we are anxious that we should not make things appear worse than they really are, we desire therefore especially to call the attention of our readers to the fact that in this passage the word theft implies something a little different from that which we generally understand by it. The notion which we generally have of theft is secret appropriation for personal gratification. Here it does not always mean that the thing appropriated is consumed in personal gratification: it may be given away to others, or spent upon self: and it may be taken from the common goods of the monastery, or from the goods assigned to the monk's own use. In the last case the chief feature of the act is that of disobedience, because it is a thing forbidden by the laws of the community, to the control of which the individual has submitted himself; it does, however, likewise involve secret appropriation, because he has no right to more than that which is sufficient for his personal support, according to the rules of the Society: and if that which he purloins is anything of the nature of clothes or of a fixture with which the monastery had supplied him, it will become necessary for the monastery to replace it. Still we should not brand it with the title of theft in the harshest sense of that word. But whenever the sum taken is purloined from the general goods of the monastery, the pilferer is then directly guilty of theft:—theft more excusable, if what is taken is given away to others; theft less excusable if retained for himself. The tariff by which monks are to steal, varies according to these differences. The sums fixed are the following:

	£	*s.*	*d.*
According to some Doctors .	0	1	8[2]
According to other Doctors .	0	2	6
According to other Doctors .	0	2	11
According to other Doctors .	0	3	4
According to other Doctors .	0	3	9
According to other Doctors .	0	5	0
According to other Doctors .	0	8	4
According to other Doctors .	0	10	0
According to other Doctors .	1	0	0
According to other Doctors .	1	5	0

[1] Theol. Mor. v. 24, 25.

[2] We have considerable doubts whether there is not a misprint of *argentei* for *aurei* in the *Theologia Moralis*, and that instead of 1*s.* 8*d.* it ought to be 1*l.*; for the same authors (Navarrus, Azorius, &c.) are quoted in the *Homo Apostolicus* for the latter sum who are set down in the former as authorizing only the less liberal amount. It is a thing which should be looked to; for it would be a serious hardship on a monk to confine him, owing to a misprint, to stealing 1*s.* 7¾*d* a-month, when he might have stolen 19*s.* 11¾*d.*

The vow of poverty, which was referred to above in the passage taken from the *Theologia Moralis*, and which, if honestly observed, would make it impossible for monks to give away anything not supplied to them for the purpose, except by first stealing it, is one of the three vows essential to the monastic life; the others being those of chastity and obedience. 'By the vow of poverty,' says the *Theologia Moralis*, 'the monk is bound to have nothing of 'his own; that is, no temporal goods which can be valued at a 'price; the ownership of these things, or, at least, the free and 'independent disposition of them, he has given up for ever.' 'By the vow of poverty,' says the *Homo Apostolicus*, 'monks 'are forbidden to possess or to dispose of anything whatsoever 'which can be valued by money.' This appears strict and self-denying. Now mark the exceptions:—

'It is not contrary to the vow of poverty, 1, *to possess goods in common*, as S. Thomas teaches, and as it is expressly allowed by the Council of Trent. It is not contrary to the vow of poverty, 2, *to possess private property*, or a maintenance, which monks in many Orders keep with the Prelate's licence; because, though according to the Council of Trent it does not seem possible to doubt that this is forbidden, since it is there said, "Let none be allowed to possess goods, moveables, or fixtures, even in the name of the convent:" nevertheless the custom which has now become almost universal, and is tolerated by the Holy See, *does* make it allowable to have private property, for necessary and honest uses, with the permission of the Superiors, provided that the monk is ready to give it up at the Prelate's nod: for the vow of poverty, though it cannot be abrogated in substance, yet (as the Doctors agree) can be changed as to its manner, according to custom, which is presumed to be right when practised by scrupulous monks, and tolerated by Superiors, who know what goes on, and do not forbid it, when they easily might.'—*Hom. Apost.* xiii. 6.

Thus we learn that custom is superior in authority to Church law and to the Decrees of Councils, and that a monk is still considered to keep his oath of possessing nothing, though he possesses things (1) in common with others, (2) in private by himself. We learn from the same chapter that Clement VIII. and Urban VIII. issued Bulls forbidding monks to make any gifts: but 'many doctors quoted by those of Salamanca, say 'that Clement's Bull has not been received, or at least has 'become obsolete, and therefore does not bind; and others 'have said the same of Urban's.' Liguori, however, thinks that this cannot be maintained, and goes off to the question of grave and light matter,—for, of course, if they give a small quantity, they make no grave transgression of the Bulls: how much that quantity may be, depends, he says, on 'the approved 'custom, according as the aforesaid Bulls have been received 'in any of the Orders.'[1] Again, we learn that 'Monks commit 'no sin in not observing their primitive rule after a contrary use

[1] Hom. Apost. xiii. 24.

'has been introduced."[1] Elsewhere we find, on the same authority, that monks may go out hunting two or three times a-year, provided they can do so without giving scandal or making a great deal of noise;[2] and it is laid down as a rule, supposing that each monk has 25*l.* a-year, he may stake 1*l.* 5*s.* every year on games of cards, &c.[3] There may be some room left for observance of the vow of poverty and strict self-denial, and we doubt not that a man who was in earnest would find it, like, for example, S. John of the Cross;[4] but we cannot be surprised to learn, still on S. Alfonso's authority, that one motive which frequently induces men to enter monasteries, and against which Confessors are desired to be on their guard, is 'the desire of spending a more comfortable life'—*vitam agendi commodiorem.*[5] Nor can one be greatly astonished at finding that it is his deliberate opinion that 'the majority of nuns (*major harum pars*) 'enter their nunneries not by the calling of God, but by the 'urgency of their parents, and hence it is that they afterwards 'lead there a life of restlessness, and introduce laxities into the

[1] Hom. Apost. xiii. 17. [2] Ibid. x. 72.

[3] 'How great a sum may a monk stake on a game? Sporer thinks that if the game is not specially forbidden by his Rule, he may stake three florins a-year. But others, as Lugo, Elbel, Sanchez, Navarrus, Gregory of Valentia, Jacobus de Graffiis, Salonius, Molina, &c. think, "with probability," that if a monk has 25*l.* a-year, he may stake 1*l.* 5*s.*, provided that he has not spent as much during the same year on other unnecessary uses. Others, again, as the Salamanca Doctors, Lugo, Molina, Azorius, &c. say that he may stake as much as he can save by spare living out of the things assigned to his use.'—Theol. Mor. l. iv. 901. This is not a very high motive for a monk's living sparely.

[4] S. Juan de la Cruz was, under S. Teresa's auspices, the great reformer of the Carmelite Order. The Breviary's account of him is short: *Severioris disciplinæ et arctioris vitæ cupidissimus, primitivam Ordinis Regulam* ex Superioris licentiâ *professus est.* It tells us, too, that *strictioris disciplinæ promovendæ ardore accensus*, he was divinely given to S. Teresa, as her assistant in restoring the observance of the original Rules; and that finally, after great toils, and worn out by sickness, he fell asleep in the 49th year of his age. His Spanish biographer enters into further details, and shows us what the 'Superior's licence' means, and what was the cause of his toils and sickness. The convent into which he entered was one where the rules were, as usual, not observed, and the young monk resolved upon keeping them. At first he was scorned for his Puritanism; then he was persecuted. He was shut up in the *carcel*, or prison of the monastery, a small dark room, admitting light only by an opening in the door: from hence he was brought out, and scourged before all the brethren, at first every day, afterwards every Friday. At last he determined to escape; he broke out of his prison, and let himself down from the convent wall by a rope, assisted, as his Biographer says, by *la Virgen Santisima.* For a time he was in danger of being retaken, but after a while he settled himself at a distance, and lived alone and unmolested. Others came and joined him, and S. Teresa suggested to him to found a new monastery on the old rule. She furnished him with money obtained from the nunneries under her control, procured him licences from Rome, and under her direction he carried out the desired reform. But it was to the sufferings which he had to undergo in his original monastery, that his Biographer (in his Life prefixed to the folio edition of his Works, and published by authority) attributes the ruin of his health, to which the Breviary refers.

[5] Prax. Conf. cap vii. 92.

'community to the common detriment.'[1] And supposing this laxity to have crept in, we do not see how it is easily to be weeded out again, for it seems that liberty of lying—we beg pardon, of covering the truth by means of words—is granted to nuns, even when subject to their Bishop's visitation:—

'It is to be noted that nuns being interrogated by the Bishop or the Prelate of the Order in the act of Visitation, are bound to discover the truth about the observance of the rule, as De Alessandro and Texeda say, even though the transgressions be light, because the relaxation of the whole rule generally begins from them.'

Bravely spoken! But now for the exceptions. Could there be one nun who would not be excused?

'Lezana and Alessandro, however, excuse nuns from telling the truth, 1. If the crime is amended: hence they infer that no one is bound to lay open another's crime committed some years since, say three years, as Mascardus thinks: and for the same reason reproof is generally to be used before denunciation. 2. Nuns are excused from telling the truth if the crime is concealed, and there is no scandal or clear proof. 3. If they are sure that the Prelate will apply no remedy; or if they know that other nuns, from whom they heard of the crime themselves, have denounced it, for no one is bound to do a useless work. 4. If telling it has a tendency to do harm to themselves. 5. If the crime is known under the obligation of a natural secret, except, however, it is productive of common damage.' —*Theol. Mor.* l. v. 57.

We have lingered so long over Liguori's Theory of Theft and of Domestic and Monastic Economy, that we have no space left for the Theory of Restitution of what is stolen. We will extract one passage from the *Praxis Confessarii*:—

'If the theft is uncertain,—*i.e.* if it is not known who the person is to whom the damage is done—the penitent is to be bound to make restitution for the purpose of having Masses celebrated, or giving alms to the poor, or making gifts to holy places, and, *if he is poor himself, he may apply it to himself, or to his family.*'—Cap. ii. 44.

For example, Pius V. decreed that, if incumbents did not say divine office, they should make restitution of a certain part of the fruits or income of the benefice: but he did not say to whom the restitution was to be made. The Casuists supply the omission:—

'It is to be given to the poor, or the Church, or to be spent on the parsonage house, or in improving the parsonage lands. And under the name of the poor come all poor people, wherever they live, and the dead, too, are meant by it. And the incumbent himself, also, may apply the said fruits to his own relief, if he is really poor, as Palao, Navarrus, Suarez, Bonacina, Toletus, Viva and Lessius say in accordance with the "common opinion." Except, however, he purposely omits office, knowing that he may keep the fruits because he is a poor man, as Palao and Viva rightly notice.'—L. iv. 672.

[1] Hom. Apost. vii. 61.

And again:—

'You are excused from making restitution of things the owner of which is uncertain, if you have made composition with the Bishop or the Pope; and also in case you are bound to restore something to the poor, and being yourself really in want, you give it to yourself—*tibi ipsi eam des;* and in this latter case, though you afterwards become richer, still you are not bound to make restitution.'—L. iv. 696.

Deridet, says Cicero, speaking of one of Verres' iniquitous tricks, *quum sibi ipsum jubet satisdare Rabonium.* What would he have said to a man stealing first and then conscientiously making restitution—*to himself?* But Cicero was a heathen, and had not the approbation of infallibility.

We have now shown at length the authorized teaching of Rome on two most important branches of Morals—on Truthfulness and Falsehood, and on Honesty and Stealing. We appeal to the unprejudiced conscience, if on these points she is indeed the high-principled, strict, unbending, religious moralist, which her advocates have represented her to be, when they have been dealing with earnest and enthusiastic minds, and it has therefore suited their purpose so to represent her. The theory of the English Church and of the Primitive Church, on the subject of Equivocation, we have shown to be the direct contradictory of that which she holds, inasmuch as England and Antiquity alike inculcate Truthfulness, and Rome justifies Deceit. With regard to theft we have no *theory*—we have a *precept,* 'Thou shalt not steal;' and the expansion of that precept by our Theologians has been for the purpose of showing how we may keep it in the spirit and in the letter, not how we may break it in the spirit while we may keep it in the letter. Anglican moralists do not frame definitions excluding what ought to be included, and then argue from their definitions. They do not employ their ingenuity in teaching how to lie without lying, how to steal without stealing, how to sin without sinning. On the subject of thieving, the Church herself explains in her Catechism what she understands by the Divine command, 'Thou shalt not steal.' The lessons which she draws from it are two, one positive and the other negative; and these she puts into the mouth of each one of her children. They are, 1. To be true and just in all my dealings. 2. To keep my hands from picking and stealing. And these two lessons are still further enforced by her Divines. Take Bishop Nicholson, for example. He writes:—

'Man may have a just title to somewhat which he may call his own, whether his title ariseth by just acquisition, inheritance, by gift or donation, or by contract. And it is the purpose of God here to secure *suum cuique,* every man in his own estate, setting a hedge and a fence about his goods

by an eternal law of commutative justice, that no man dare to break over, or rush upon, what is his, without an apparent injury and an affront done to God. This being the end, (1.) *Here is commanded*, 1. That every man be content with his estate, and to have moderate desires. 2. To preserve our neighbour's goods, and to suffer every man to enjoy his own quietly and fairly. 3. To give and pay every man his due, and injure no man. 4. To use justice in all our dealings, contracts, bargains. 5. To be frugal, and not to spend above our estates. 6. To use honest means to get a livelihood, viz. prayer and labour. 7. To use our goods to benefit others justly, liberally, cheerfully. 8. That we restore what is unjustly gotten or detained. (2.) *Here is forbidden*, 1. Injustice, violence, oppression. 2. Covetousness, and hoarding up all that comes in. 3. Tenacity or the niggard's hand. 4. Contentiousness, and vexatious lawsuits. 5. Immoderate care and solicitude. 6. Deceit, fraud, circumvention in bargaining, contracts, buying, selling. 7. Picking and stealing, or secret purloinings. 8. Open robbery, violence, plundering, and rapacity. 9. False weights and measures. 10. Sacrilege: to detain tithes, tribute, custom. 11. To borrow and not to pay again when they are able. 12. To detain hirelings' wages, cheat orphans and widows. 13. To embezzle other men's estates and fail a trust. 14. To receive bribes and to set justice to sale. 15. To break their promise, and refuse to stand to their bargains. 16. To embase and adulterate coin, and pass it for good and perfect. 17. Prodigality, to waste their own estate. 18. They who make not restitution offend. 19. To live an idle life, and not to use honest labour to live.'—*Bishop Nicholson on the Catechism*, p. 114.

We can conceive the lofty contempt with which a disciple of S. Alfonso would look down upon the simplicity which could have dictated this teaching. 'What? not one word about pur-'loining not being thieving? Nothing about extreme and quasi-'extreme necessity? Nothing about distressed noblemen pro-'viding for themselves out of other people's goods? Nothing 'about robbing Turks? No reference to grave and light 'matter? Nothing about mortal and venial thieving? No 'tariff laid down to steal by? No thieving-licence given to 'wives and children? No permission of pilfering to servants 'and monks? No theory of secret compensation? Secret pur-'loining and the use of short weights and measures absolutely 'forbidden? Bribes not to be received by judges? Promises 'not to be broken? Such is the result of Anglican negations! 'Thanks to Heaven that we are living where Morals have been 'studied and systematized under the humane and indulgent 'supervision of the Holy Roman Church!'

ART. V.— *Outlines of the Philosophy of Universal History, applied to Language and Religion.* By CHEVALIER BUNSEN. London: Longmans. 1854.

IN a recent article on Mr. Dennis's 'Cities and Cemeteries of Etruria,' we engaged to revert to a special branch of Etruscan archæology—the national language, the only key to the origin of the race—whenever Chevalier Bunsen's long-promised volumes should issue from the press. We cannot feel otherwise than disappointed that these learned and laborious researches have thrown no fuller and clearer light upon this mysterious enigma; a result, however, which ought to be attributed far more to the poverty of the materials to which the ethnological theory is applied,—the paucity of monumental inscriptions, and the non-existence of any national literature,—than to defects inherent in the Chevalier's method of investigation. Before, however, we present to the reader the results of M. Bunsen's labours, it may be well to pass briefly in review the leading speculations which have been broached upon this perplexing question, since the study of Etruscan lore first arrested the attention of the antiquarian world. This we owe in mere courtesy to our readers, since the value of the Chevalier's contributions can only be estimated by comparison with those of others, with whose researches, in so abstruse a province of classical learning, the generality of our readers can hardly be expected to be very familiar.

One of the earliest theories, which found especial favour among the ultramontane learned, assumed the Etruscans to be originally a Transalpine race, who, descending as conquerors into the plains of the Po, had gradually pushed their settlements in a southerly direction. The idea was not destitute of ancient authority and classical countenance; it was supported by the recorded fact, that there really were, at a later period, in the Rhætian Alps, tribes speaking the Etruscan dialect. The term Rasena was brought into connexion with 'Rhætian,' and the Celtic and Teutonic dialects were held, for the moment, safer guides than the Egyptian or the Hebrew. The theory, however, though afterwards renewed with more success by Niebuhr and his school, did not at the time attract numerous adherents; it was succeeded, in the then prevailing rage for Oriental etymology, by the Phœnico-Egyptian delusion, which, at first, won popular opinion, though its futilities ere long caused it to be hissed off the historical arena, with much justice, as its own

authors candidly confessed. The classical theory of interpretation now became the favourite. Antecedent probability, in the absence of any positive evidence, countenanced the connexion of a primitive people of Italy with the Latins and Greeks, rather than with Arabs and Egyptians. The mischievous plausibilities of Lanzi, the pillar of this system, long proved a serious impediment to the progress of sound inquiry. He neglected the distinction between the Etruscan inscriptions proper, and those of the various conterminous tribes, Umbrians, Oscans, &c., which doubtless contain an admixture of Greek and Latin elements never hitherto discoverable in the Etruscan tongue. Various etymological expedients (lucus a non lucendo) were invoked in aid of this fallacious system; transposition, substitution, intercalation of grammatical forms, were all enlisted, and exhausted in the process. *Hupitaiseke* becomes, in his arbitrary vocabulary, *ὑποτέθεικε*, monumentum posuit: *Turke* is discovered to be *δώρευκε* (*δεδώρευκε*): *Tular* is merely the Etruscan form of *τὸ ὁλλάριον*: not to fatigue the reader with other illustrations, deservedly ridiculed by a clever contemporary some ten years ago, who remarked that 'here lieth' would give equally good Greek for *ἱερὸς λίθος*: 'this stone' for *δύστονος*, &c.

The proverbial prejudices of the Italian literati soon afterwards found an eloquent advocate in Micali, who rallied all the learning of his time in support of the opinion of Dionysius, that the Etruscans were an indigenous Italian race. This doctrine was shortly afterwards attacked by Niebuhr, who recurred to the Rhætian theory of Frèret, believing the Etruscans to have been a tribe from the Rhætian Alps, who conquered the Tyrrhene Pelasgi, the earlier possessors of the land. He defended his own version of their origin by the resemblance—a resemblance, we need hardly say, palpable only to the second-sight of etymologists—of the name 'Rasena,' which the Etruscans used to designate themselves, to 'Rhæti;' by the statements of the ancients, that the Rhætians were of Etruscan extraction; by the analogy which certain dialects now spoken in those regions bear to the Etruscan; and also by the fact that no earlier population than the Etruscan is recorded to have inhabited those mountains. The fact, however, that ancient monuments resembling the Etruscan, and inscriptions in a character very similar, have been found among the Rætian and Novic Alps, though it may in a great degree authenticate the connexion of Etruria with those regions, can only support the theory of the original extraction of the people thence, at the expense of the Roman authorities of Livy, Justin, and Pliny, who concurrently declare the Etruscan emigration to have been from the south in a northerly direction. A modification of Niebuhr's view was

held by Ottfried Müller,—that the later element in the Etruscan nation was derived from Lydia, yet composed not of natives, but of Tyrrhene Pelasgi, who had settled on the coasts of Asia Minor; and that the earlier lords of the land were the Rasena, from the mountains of Rhætia, who, driving back the Umbrians, and uniting with the Tyrrheni on the Tarquinian coast, constituted the Etruscan race.

The next champion who appeared on the lists of the archæological arena was Sir W. Betham, the late Ulster King-at-arms, whose Quixotic caprices may possibly be more amusing to the reader than the dry and barren details we have hitherto been forced to record. He broached the extraordinary theory, that the Etruscans, the Phœnicians, and the old Milesians of Erin were the same people, speaking identically the same Erse; that Etruria was colonized from the east, then Ireland from Etruria. He endeavoured, by the most ludicrous devices, to substantiate this system by an analysis of the Eugubian tables, and the great Etruscan inscription of Perugia. By appeals to archaic glossaries and obsolete dialects, by capricious divisions of words and syllables, and other expedients of a despairing invention, he elicited from an examination of the first of these documents the valuable discovery that it contained, in old Erse, an account of the colonization of Ireland, with a log-book of the voyage which led to the event. The commencement of the second Eugubian table may serve as a specimen of his method: No. I. is the text according to its own subdivision of words; No. II. is Sir William's Hiberno-Punic edition; Nos. III. and IV. are his two English versions:—

'I. BUKUKUM: IUBIU: PUNE: UBEF: FURFATH: TREF:
BITLUF: TURUF: MARTE: THURIE: FETU:
PUPLUPER: TUTAS: IIUBINAS &c.

'II. Bu co com iud be i u Pune u be fa for fath tre fa
bi at lu fa tur u fa mar ta tur i e fad
u pob lu bar to ta is i iud be i na is &c.

'III. Was which security day and night in from Phœnician from night means defence by skill throughout the means being also water means voyage from the means as indeed the voyage in it far away people water of the sea is gentle indeed it is by wisdom day and night in it is &c.

'IV. There was security, day and night, during the whole voyage to and from the river, Phœnician, from the night precautions and skill, and there being deep water in the river. By this skill in distant voyages of the people of the water to the north, is the sea indeed practicable; secure by day and night, gentle, indeed, in the sea, it is, &c.'

A clever contributor to the Quarterly Review undertook to ct out of these inscriptions, through the medium of any nguage of Europe, living or dead, better sense than Sir

William elicited from his imaginary Hiberno-Phœnician,—nay, real sense, for in the jargon quoted above there is obviously no sense at all. In submitting the following sample of what might be done for the Teutonic family, he assumed only, with more modesty than Sir William, that the Eugubian tables are written in a primitive, but still intelligible, Anglo-Saxon dialect; and that the second table contains, not a log-book of voyages to Erin, but a commercial treaty between the Etruscans and the Phœnicians; 'one written in current grammatical 'sense, without Ulsterian transpositions, and with vastly less 'than Ulsterian corruption of the original Umbrian text:'—

'Bi ok u kum iu bi o Pune o bef for fat drov bi tal of Tur of Mart Ethruria fed o pupl u pa her tute as iu bi in as &c.

'By oak you come, you buy, O Phœnician, o' beef, four fat drove, by tale of Tyre, of the Mart of Etruria; feed, O people! you pay her duty, as you buy, in asses, &c.'

'In "oak," for oaken ship, the correspondence with the Latin terms, abies, trabs, and the modern Italian legno, is remarkable; both probably traceable to the same Etruscan usage. The "tale" (perhaps toll?) of Tyre, specifies doubtless the number of oxen in each drove contracted for, according to some conventional Phœnician standard. The apostrophe, "feed O people," is a fine sample of the combination of the poetical with the practical, common in such documents among a primitive race. The as, we need scarcely add, was the current Etruscan coin. The commencement of the first table reads equally well. It specifies the different prices or duties of corn:—

'"Punic corn is paid, o' rye, at a higher, yea a bye code; no reclaim (drawback?) &c."'

We shall close our list with Mrs. Hamilton Gray, who, unhappily for her literary fame, imbibed all the prejudices of the old Egyptian school. She assumed Etruscan emigration from a certain Mesopotamian city, whose Scriptural name was Resen, and whose Egyptian title she conveniently supposes to have been Ludim. Hence, of course, their designations, Rasena and Lydian. From Resen she transports them to Egypt, whence they are expelled by the native powers, and accordingly cross to the Italian coast. 'Had she but made them,' says the reviewer alluded to above, 'on traversing the Mediterranean, 'land first in Gaul, and cross the Rhætian Alps into Lombardy, 'she would have had the merit of blending the Phœnician, 'Egyptian, Lydian, Libyan, and Celtic systems into one.' Having, in a recent article upon Mr. Dennis's work, adverted in some detail to that exploded superstition, the Egypto-Oriental mania, we are sure our readers will readily dispense with any refutation of Mrs. H. Gray's theory here; the more, as its features present scarcely any variation from those in which it has long been familiar to the public in the pages of the Universal History.

We have no intention of plunging our readers into M. Bunsen's voluminous researches, further than is necessary to reflect the few additional rays of light which they cast upon the problem before us. Before, however, the Chevalier records the latest results of comparative philology, in reference to the Etruscan enigma, there are several interesting pages, in which he traces the gradual development of the philosophy of language from the earliest era of critical inquiry; the contents of which, especially as they bear closely upon the subject at issue, will probably be acceptable to many of our readers.

In laying them before the public, we must revert to the old style of reviewing—that of citation at length—in the assurance that it would be impossible to condense them with effect. An outline of the history of philological science from the era of Pythagoras and Plato to that of Leibnitz, the author of the 'Comparative Philosophy of Language,' and the first successful classifier of the languages then known, is given in the following terms:—

'The profound passage in Genesis (ii. 19), "And out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air, and brought them unto Adam, to see *what he would call them;* and whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that was the name thereof," finds its philosophical echo in Pythagoras. Jamblichus and Proclus report the following as one of his sayings: Having been asked What was the wisest among things? he answered, "Number;" and, What next in wisdom? "The Name-giver." This is explained by the account preserved in Clemens of Alexandria (*Ecl. Proph.* i. 32), that Pythagoras thought of all wise men he was not only the most rational, but also the most ancient, who gave the names to things. Pythagoras, as well as the Bible, supposes man to have formed language, and both consider this act as primitive, and analogous to that of the Divine mind, by which there is order and measure in the universe. With Heraclitus, "the dark," and Democritus, his contemporary, begins the antagonism which pervades the whole Greek and Latin philosophy of language. Heraclitus considered the words of language as the shadow of bodies, or the image reflected in the mirror—types of objective reality; whereas the other school saw in them products of convention. According to one, language existed by nature (objectively); according to the other, by a positive arbitrary act of man (subjectively). The first were, according to another term, analogists; the others, anomalists. Plato, in his "Cratylus," and Aristotle in his "Organon," may be said, however, to be the men who, upon the traces of their predecessors, have laid the foundations of the philosophy of language. Plato, following Pythagoras and Socrates, is an analogist; Aristotle tends to anomalism; but as Plato acknowledges the positive or conventional element, so Aristotle does not deny the objectivity which lies at the bottom of language. He is startled by the fact that the languages of men are so many and so different, and, therefore, places the conventional element first; but, as he expressly says (*De Animâ*, c. i.) that the sounds of the voice are symbolical of the affections of the soul, we must not interpret this only of the interjectional sounds, but also of the words expressing things and thought, or real language. The speculations of Plato, when rightly understood, bear upon the highest problems of the philosophy of language; the categories and defini-

tions of Aristotle lay the logical foundations of our grammatical system, and establish by themselves the great principle, that language is the immediate product and expression—as it were—the mirror of logic and thought. In the speculations of both we see the entire want of an abstract knowledge of the etymological rules of their own language, and still more of a system, or even a tendency, to compare the Greek tongue with those of the barbarians. Nor did the later philosophers and philologers of Greece and Rome pursue such a course. Epicurus acknowledges expressly the two elements, and places that which comes from nature through the affections of the soul first; the positive element second. The Stoics originated the grammar, and, in particular, proposed the first theory of the Greek verb and its conjugation. Aristophanes, Aristarchus, and Crates, and, at a later period, Apollonius Dyscolus, were the acute and learned members of the Alexandrian Academy who erected that fabric of grammatical definitions and terms which, brought nearer to us by Varro and the later Latin grammarians, has formed the basis of our grammatical system, and, through the Syrian Christians, of that of the Arabs. The Indian grammar, however, is original and ancient.

'As to the lexicographical[1] inquiries and speculations of the ancients, their blunders in both are proverbial, and constitute an important fact in the history of the human mind. Their absurd etymologies[2] are the most striking proof of the impossibility of man becoming conscious of his peculiarities, except by contrast and comparison with those of others. If the Roman world did little for the philosophy of language, though even Cæsar speculated and wrote upon it, the Byzantine age, in this branch also, did nothing but preserve the corpse of ancient science, reduced to formularies and epitomes, such as ages sinking into materialism, or any other form of barbarism, generally prefer to scientific and learned investigations.

'The Germanic middle ages had not the means, and did not feel the vocation, for inquiring into realities; although Christianity had given them the idea of humanity as distinct from nationality; and although the study of Latin, and afterwards of Greek, and the acquaintance with the Saracens, led them naturally to a greater knowledge of the properties and diversities of language. The genial and free philosophy of the fifteenth century,

---

[1] This censure is far too indiscriminate. In some respects the Greek lexicographers surpassed our own in the extent and variety of their researches. We have no vocabularies specially devoted to the phraseology of our great writers,—of Chaucer, of Milton, of Shakspeare; whereas Grecian literature possessed, from the times of Gorgias (440 B.C.) various collections of Homeric, Platonic, and other elegant phraseology. Shortly after the era of salvation, a voluminous library of glossaries and onomastica, lexica of rare terms, classical terms, idiomatic terms, appeared under the auspices of Tryphon (30 B.C.), Diogenianus (130 B.C.), Pamphilus, Julius Pollux (A.D. 180), and, at a later period, Hesychius and Suidas. Their great defect, however, was that they had no complete dictionary in a comprehensive form; that the philological, and the historical, or descriptive departments were often confused; and that they were by no means uniformly arranged in alphabetical order.

[2] The ridiculous etymologies so gravely authorized by Quintilian are probably familiar to every scholar. The celebrated *lucus a non lucendo* he is responsible for. On the same principle—the cool prefix of a negation—he derives *ludus* (a school), 'quia longissimè a lusu!' *verbum* he deduces *ab aere verberato;* but his bachelor prejudices are ludicrously evinced in the account he gives of the term *cælibes*, which he connects with *cælites*, 'quod onere gravissimo vacant,' in his own gallant explanation. He might have been a better etymologist had he been a worse naturalist: aware of the solitary propensities of the blackbird, he ingeniously derives *merula* from *mera* (sola) *volans!*

which, on the one hand, prepared the way for the great Reformation of the sixteenth, gained, on the other, by this most memorable event of modern history, an unrestrained liberty of inquiry, and the feeling of the sacredness of national tongues. It thus opened the way to wider researches, at the same time that the discoveries of the Spaniards and Portuguese laid a new world open before the awakening European mind. Antonio Pignafetta, an Italian, collected lists of words out of the tongues of the tribes and nations through which he travelled.

'But the only effective progress in linguistic philosophy and knowledge made by the sixteenth century, was due to classical philology, combined with the study of Hebrew. The necessity of explaining the Old Testament from its original language led to the study and comparison of Arabic, Syriac, and Aramaic; and it is only necessary to know the two great luminaries of France, Scaliger and Bochart, to form an idea of the extent and importance of the progress made in this field of science.

'On this foundation the seventeenth century attempted to build, so far as its struggles for religious and civil liberty would allow. But, owing to the overwhelming power of the political and ecclesiastical reaction in the greater part of that century, all it achieved in this field was a cumbrous, uncritical superstructure of lexicography. There was no philosophical principle in the speculation of that century, nor any great historical problem to guide its philology, which could have led either towards physiological or philological discoveries concerning the tribes and languages of mankind.

'The mighty genius of Bacon was, indeed, aware of the importance and mysterious nature of language. The first chapter of the sixth book *De Augmentis Scientiarum* contains ample proofs of both. He there enumerates among the *desiderata*, as a portion of the doctrine *De Organo Sermonis*, a treatise *De Notis Rerum*, by which he means a philosophical catalogue of real signs (*characteres reales*), corresponding with the number of *radical* words, and also a philosophical grammar. There is enough for centuries in both these problems. There is also much of wisdom implied in his general invaluable principles of induction and analogy; and it is to be regretted that these germs have not been hitherto fully developed. But Bacon himself did nothing towards that object, with respect to language. He neither developed the principles of grammar, nor of the formation of words; still less did he attempt a classification of languages, or try to establish a method of inquiry into their nature and origin.'—Vol. i. pp. 39—43.

The Chevalier then illustrates the further development of philological science, from the Baconian era to our own. The great object of Leibnitz, in the foundation of the Academy of Sciences at Berlin, as his memoir of 1700 proves, was to establish the study of the comparative philosophy of language; and to classify the then known languages in order to trace the genealogy of mankind. The torch, as it fell from the hands of Leibnitz, was rekindled, with additional lustre, by Blumenbach and Prichard. Previous to their researches, the philosophers of the eighteenth century had scorned the idea of the unity of the human race; and theologians had unhappily assisted them in making the Bible say, that God had created language as he had created man, and that language was not the act and work of man. Under the auspices of these eminent contributors to science,

the combined light of philology, physiology, ethnology and geography, was brought to bear upon the problem; and science supported the Scriptural theory of the original unity of the human species. There were, however, several stages of the philological arena yet to be traversed. What was the method of defining near or more distant relationship, and of distinguishing between historical and accidental, original and subsequent connexion between the languages of the earth? In the solution of these questions, the next step was taken by a German: and it was India, and the English researches into Sanskrit, which elicited that step. In 1808, Frederic Schlegel, in his 'Essay on the Language and Philosophy of the Hindoos,' fully established the decisive importance and precedence which grammatical forms ought to have over single words, in proving the affinities of language. By an application of his method, he triumphantly showed the intimate historical connexion between the Sanskrit, Persian, Greek, Roman and Germanic languages. The new linguistic school of Germany followed up the impulse given by Schlegel; a host of writers successively traced the different branches of languages connected with the Sanskrit; the unscientific expression of 'Eastern languages' was abandoned by the learned; the circle of Indo-Germanic tongues was gradually enlarged, till it embraced the Lithuanian, the Slavonic, and, finally, all the languages of Celtic origin. It was thus that the *desiderata* of Bacon, and the fundamental idea of Leibnitz, had, to a considerable degree, been carried out by the gradual establishment of a method for analyzing a given language, and detecting its affinities with another of the same family. The next step was to unite, and examine philosophically and methodically, all the different forms of human language, with a full knowledge of all the modern discoveries. It was achieved in the posthumous work of Humboldt (1836), 'On 'the Diversity of the Formation of Human Language, and its 'Influence on the Intellectual Development of Mankind.' Commencing with the simplest elements of speech, he gradually proceeds to the construction of a sentence, as the expression of intellect and thought. He then shows that the Chinese—the opposite pole to the Sanskrit—is a perfect form in its kind. In examining, explaining, and comparing the different means used by different nations to render single words susceptible of signs, destined to mark their position in a sentence, he shows that all accomplish this more or less imperfectly, with the exception of the Sanskritic family, in which he gives the prize to the language of the Hellenes. Thus he is brought irresistibly to the result, that the Chinese tongue and the Sanskritic family represent the two extremes of all known formations of speech;

while he considers the Semitic languages as standing on the same line with the Sanskritic, in consequence of their decided tendency towards the system of inflexional forms.

We must now allow M. Bunsen to describe in his own terms the existing phase of philological research; to which we will subjoin his account of the latest results arising from the application of his principles to the meagre fragments, which are all that have hitherto been revealed, of the Etruscan tongue:

'Whatever,' he says, 'has been successfully achieved in behalf of linguistic science, has been obtained by the critical method of philological analysis. While valuing all materials for what they are worth, I do not think that crude glossaries of languages not understood are proper materials for comparative ethnology; and I consider all conjectures and systems built upon such materials, as below scientific consideration. It is also, I think, now more generally acknowledged, and, indeed, proved by incontestable facts, that all critical philological results must remain incomplete until they become historical. All philology must end in history; but the historical results of those linguistic researches are infinitely greater than many learned historians imagine. . . . . If we examine the last of these inquiries, we shall find that those only which belong to what may be termed centrical ethnology, based upon comparative philology, have furnished any conclusive result. Almost all languages of nations which have a history and a literature, have been linguistically traced to Central Asia; and the only natural method which can ensure real progress, appears to be to increase this stock, by confronting progressively isolated phenomena with the now historical centre. But this must be done methodically. Whenever in Asia, in Europe, in Africa, or elsewhere, we find family groups of languages, we must, first of all, try to define the respective position of each member, or relation to the other portions of the same family. We shall then have to ascertain methodically the relative position of the different families. This relative position is a double one. First, that of the members among each other. Thus we shall gradually obtain African, American and Polynesian groups, organically arranged, and prepared for being elevated into the sphere of universal history. To find the proper place for each group in the history of tongues, is the second aim of this comparative examination. In order to obtain the desired results for both purposes, a twofold critical operation is required. First, a grammatical analysis of every single language, based upon native composition and speech. The second operation will be, to gather round a common centre all such languages as, by their grammar and construction, undeniably belong to one and the same family, and to endeavour to discover which of its branches exhibits the idiom in its greatest purity and perfection. The most ancient and best preserved must be placed at the head, as the representative of the family in the history of mankind. It is only when we have reached this point, that we may knock at the door of universal history, and demand admission for the hitherto isolated family into the historical stock.'—Vol. i. pp. 61—63.

In the second chapter, the last results of the Italic researches, as far as they affect the Etruscan problem, are given in the following terms:

'Niebuhr's historical criticism had put an end to a host of groundless and unscientific conjectures and dreams respecting the languages of primi-

tive Italy, and cleared the ground for solid linguistic research. For, as linguistic research is blind without philology, so is philology without history. Niebuhr's general tendency in language was distinction; and what he found to be essentially heterogeneous was likely to appear to him autochthonic, and original from the beginning. This was the case with the Etruscan. Disgusted with the unscrupulous and rambling method of Lanzi and his followers, who had ransacked the Greek dictionary, and drawn largely upon their own imaginations, and the credulity of their readers, in order to make the Etruscan language what its alphabet evidently is, an archaic form of the Hellenic, Niebuhr maintained that the Etruscan was a purely barbarous language; that it is wholly distinct from the other more or less Latinising tongues of Italy Proper, of the Apennines, and even of the Alps; that the ruling nations of Etruria came from the North; and that the roots of the language must be looked for in Rætia. This verdict of Niebuhr, so far from being shaken, is confirmed by all the serious and connected philological or historical researches which have been since instituted on the subject.

'It was, of course, this language which attracted, from the first appearance of Niebuhr's "Roman History," the united efforts of philologers and linguists. Ottfried Müller, in his truly learned work, "Die Etrusker," (1828), gave the first critical outlines of the grammar, as well as of the alphabet. In the lectures delivered by me at the Archæological Institute at Rome, I advanced the theory I still maintain, that the Etruscan bears strong marks of being a mixed language, from the circumstance of such grammatical forms as have been ascertained being evidently analogous to what we know of Indo-Germanic flexions; whereas the greater part of the words which occur in the inscriptions prove most provokingly heterogeneous. On the other hand, the Tyrrhenic glosses in Hesychius (if they be of any value), and the inscription found in 1836 at Agylla, under the ruins of Etruscan Cære, and illustrated by Lepsius, contain words much more akin to the Græco-Latin stock. I do not think that the abundance of vowels can be accounted for by the assumption that this, and some similar inscriptions, represent a more ancient period. Until we possess bilinguar inscriptions of some extent, we shall be unable to interpret them; but we cannot be mistaken as to their sounding less barbarous, or more like Greek or Latin, than the others. If, then, we have in the Etruscan a Græco-Latinising grammar, and a mixed vocabulary, and apply to these phenomena the general theory of mixed language, it does not follow that the barbarous lexicographical elements are entirely un-Indo-Germanic; for Celtic, though decidedly barbarous, still forms a part of that family. But it does follow, from the analogy of all we know, that the groundwork of the language is indicated by the grammar, the indestructible badge of near kinship; and that, in its origin, the Etruscan was much more akin to Greek and Latin, and the other Italic languages, than that element, which forms in the monuments, (that of Agylla and some smaller ones excepted,) the predominant part of the vocabulary. A mixed language of this kind would be the natural consequence of a non-Italic tribe having taken possession of Tyrrhenia, or the Mediterranean part of Central Italy, subdued the Italic indigenous population, and finally adopted their language, as the Norman conquerors did that of the Saxons, or the Arabs that of Persia. The coincidence of this result of an independent linguistic research, with Niebuhr's demonstration of the Northern (Rætian) origin of the Etruscans, attested by inscriptions found in an uninterrupted line, from that Alpine land and the Tyrol down to Tarquinii, appeared to me remarkable; the two researches seem mutually to confirm each other. The intrinsic nature of the language, as we find it in the monuments, leads also to the conclusion that the Greek words were a foreign element, received, but not

understood. Making every allowance for a different system of vocalisation, such changes as

Pultuke from Polynikes, Akhmiem from Agamemnon,

are unmistakeably barbarous, and betray an absolute ignorance of the elements of which the Greek name is composed.

'Thus *atrium* may have been inorganically formed from *ἄιθριον*. But as to *haruspex*, which is also said to be an Etruscan word, we shall see below[1] that it is thoroughly Latin, and has its Indo-Germanic root; it may, for all that, have been Etruscan, but it is not a corruption of *ἱεροσκόπος*. Both also may have been words of the conquered Helleno-Italic population of Etruria. Indeed, *vorsus*, "a square of one hundred feet," is quoted as being both Tuscan and Umbrian; and it is admitted that the Umbrians originally occupied Tyrrhenia.'—Vol. i. pp. 84—87.

Subjoined is Dr. Aufrecht's report of the last results of his Etruscan researches:

'The convincing proofs of the Indo-European character of the Etruscan grammar, are principally the following facts:

'1. On the Cippus Pennimus we find the following forms of the word Velthina:

Velthina, Velthinas, Velthinam.

That *s* is the genitive termination, as in the other Indo-European languages, is undeniable.

'2. We find *a, ia*, the termination of female names, exactly as in Greek and Latin.

'3. *Al* is the patronymic and metronymic termination, which evidently corresponds with the Latin *Alis*, as in Australis, Arvalis, Triumphalis.

'4. *Sa* added to a man's name indicates the name of his wife; thus *Larthial—i—sa* means the consort of the son of Larthius. This form also bears the character of the Indo-Germanic languages, while that syllable has a genitive signification. In a similar way, the Greek genitive in *οιο*, originally *οσιο*, is not properly a case, but an adjective, *ἱππο—σ—ιο* = equestris. The barbarous sound of the words in the Etruscan inscriptions, certainly cannot be explained by the accumulation of consonants alone; for earlier inscriptions, (that of Agylla and some shorter ones,) have many more vowels than the later. The only admissible explanation of this phenomenon is the assumption, that the Etruscan is a mixed language. We have abundant examples that the consequence of a mixture of two very different languages is, that they both become decomposed, and lose their former clearness, lexically as well as etymologically. I assume it to be a historical fact, that the conquering Etruscans took Tyrrhenia from the Umbrians; and I deny the historical existence of Pelasgi in Italy, whether their language were akin to Greek or not.

'I have, therefore, adopted another mode of getting nearer to the barbarous element in Etruscan. The Euganean inscriptions which are found in the southern part of Rætia, as well as in Lombardy, particularly about Padua, and other ancient inscriptions which have come to light in that district, exhibit the same alphabet, (except that the O occurs in them, which is unknown in Southern Etruria,) and a language, which, in its character, bears strong resemblance to the Etruscan. But I abstain from following up this conjecture until new monuments come to our aid.'

As long as there is no bilingual monument of any extent, the fruits of Dr. Freund's mission to Rætia by the Berlin

[1] he supposes it had a common root with *hariolus*, and meant simply to observe the entrails of victims.

Academy of Sciences, to which allusion was made in our former article, cannot be reaped. The last researches instituted on the specific Romanic language now spoken there, having shown that, beside the ordinary Romanic words, and some roots bearing a Celtic character, there remained about one-tenth which could not be reduced to either, he engaged in this expedition, with the view of examining this mysterious caput mortuum. He discovered a far greater number of the words of that primitive residue than he expected. The fact of their existence is of great importance; but it will be difficult to identify them, until a monument, of the character described above, shall have been discovered.

In pronouncing the Etruscan to be a mixed language, the results of philology conspire with ethnological conclusions. The national civilization is obviously similar in character; it has its Oriental, it has its classical affinities; but the latter never formed the prevalent type. The Etruscan influence in Italy presents many points of analogy to the Moorish dominion in Spain; the Moors left no enduring legacy of arts and social culture to posterity, and the Etruscans, though brought into intimate connexion with the two noblest nations of antiquity, never attained to Greek and Roman humanities.

Up to the present time, then, modern research has only effected for Etruria the discovery, that her language belongs to the Indo-European family; with what elements it was blended, what was its relationship to other members of the same family, is a question still to be cleared up; its obscurity can only be dispelled by the discovery of monumental remains and inscriptions, to which a scientific philological theory may be applied.

Before closing this article, it may be well to point to the elucidation which recent researches have given to a well-known remark of Niebuhr, who, in illustrating his belief that the Latin was a mixed language, referred to the fact that, whereas the words belonging to the sphere of peaceable rural life agree in Greek and Latin, the Latin expressions for everything belonging to warfare, arms, and hunting, have no words corresponding to them in Greek. Upon this illustration Dr. Arnold founded the gratuitous illusion, 'that the Latin people arose 'out of a conquest of the Pelasgians (the Greek element) by 'the Oscans; so that the latter were the ruling class of the 'united nation, the former were its subjects.'—*Roman History*, vol. i. p. 22.

This is a mere conjecture, which ought not to have been intruded, in its peremptory dogmatic form, as an undoubted historical conclusion. It is entirely unauthorzied by subsequent discovery; comparative philology shows the fact referred to to be

of general occurrence in the Indo-Germanic languages. 'It 'must, therefore,' observes Dr. Aufrecht, 'be explained in a 'manner applicable to all, by the circumstance that those 'nations once lived as peaceable herdsmen,' (the primitive occupation of the human race,) 'and, in part, at least, as agricul-'turists, in their original Asiatic abodes.' Thus, the names of the most important domestic animals, and only a few of the wild beasts, as wolf and bear, and the words for primitive wants, (breadstuffs, metals, names of consanguinity and affinity in their furthest extensions,) are, as we must naturally expect, found to be identical, not only in Greek and Latin, but also in the Germanic,[1] Lithuanian, and Slavonic languages. 'These words, 'therefore,' says the learned Doctor, 'are the Asiatic heir-loom 'of the civilized nations of Europe.' So that, if we find, in the different branches of this stock, different words for the implements of hunting and warfare, we must conclude that they were fixed after the separation took place. In Greek and Latin, however, the diverging terms quoted by Niebuhr, in proof of a mixture, are generally reducible to roots[2] common to all the branches. The natural explanation of this is, that the Greeks and Romans lived longer together, and adopted in common, about the same period, a more southerly direction; whereas the Germans and Slavonics took, or kept in common, a more northerly one.

---

[1] *E.g. Mother*, Osc. amma; old high Germ. amma; compare Ger. amme (nurse); Icelandic, amma (grandmother); Sanskrit, amâ. The Italic expression for *man*, in opposition to woman, is, Lat. Vir; Umbr. Veir; Teut. Ver; in Skr. Vîras.

[2] Dr. Aufrecht exhibits, in proof of this, the etymology of the very words chosen by Niebuhr as instances. *Scutum* is the Greek σκῦτος, from the root sku, 'to cover;' *Parma*, πάρμη; *Jaculum*, from jacere, *ἰάπτω*; *Arma*, from arcere, 'that which defends, wards off;' Gr. ἀρκεῖν, ἀλάλκειν. In some others mentioned by him the resemblance is far-fetched.

ART. VI.—1. *Census of Great Britain*, 1851. *Education. England and Wales. Report and Tables.* London, 1854.

2. *Minutes of the Committee of Council on Education.* London, 1854.

No department of the Census of 1851, is probably more calculated to produce some practical results than that of education. The secular or general census of the whole population, contains indeed much useful and curious information, which may, in the working of political economy, be turned to valuable account; but in dealing with it, we seem to have before us those great stubborn facts of human life, which are beyond any direct or voluntary control. Births and deaths, or the various ages to which different sexes and classes attain, according to their pursuits or occupations, are, in great measure, facts that remain uninfluenced in the future by the knowledge of the past. They are governed by stern laws of necessity, which act on the inner self of each individual rather than on the community as a whole, and which are beyond any combined or legislative efforts materially to change. The mass or substance on which it is necessary here to operate, is no less than the community itself; it cannot be viewed in the light of an external object to be dealt with as improved knowledge shall direct; but the most we can reasonably hope for, is that our own discretion, with a few compulsory hints, may teach us as a people to become better, wiser, cleaner, more sober, and, therefore, more likely to escape certain evils, which follow the neglect of prudent and wholesome counsel. Much the same may be said of the census of religion; that kind of knowledge which statistics give to the mind, has not much affinity with matters of faith, or the choice of a religion. It is hopeless to expect that any very direct influence can be brought to bear on the public at large, simply from the knowledge of certain varieties in the religious choice of individuals, who act in each case from strong personal motives, far outweighing in importance any effects of a census-table, and over which we have no control.

With regard, however, to education, there is this difference. A distinct subject-matter exists, which is external to ourselves, and with which, moreover, there is felt a very general, and almost unanimous, desire to deal, in an active and practical

'1st. Does the present state of education, as exhibited above, display considerable advance upon its state in former periods, so as to give evidence of *progress?*

'2d. What number of children, out of the population of England and Wales in 1851, should constantly be found at school?—involving the questions of school age, duration of school attendance, &c.

'3d. What is the *character of the instruction* afforded to existing scholars?' —*Census*, 1851, p. xv.

Under the head of the first question, it may almost be said, that popular education is the work of the present century. Sunday-schools date their first origin to Raikes of Gloucester, in 1781, and they seem to have prepared the way for an appreciation of learning, that ended in a general call for daily education. Whether popular education has always, in past ages, been neglected to the extent that it was the case when those who now are old men and women were boys and girls, is a question of historical interest, which we cannot now discuss; but certain it is, that those were days of literary ignorance, such as can now hardly be conceived. It is the common saying of old people, 'There were no schools in my time,' and such really appears to have been the case; indeed in many parts of the country, the existence of a school is still a novelty, and persons are even now to be found, who assert that education is out of place in those who have to earn their living by hard labour in the fields. Unhappily, the Church did not commence the educational movement; though, of late years, she has been the great practical instrument of it: even while they, who in political sentiments, succeed to the old 'march of intellect' schools, appear satisfied with empty declamations about national progress; themselves having taken no further part in the work, than that of hampering the real practical agencies of it.

'The *popular day-school* epoch dates from 1796, when the youthful Quaker, Joseph Lancaster, began, in his father's house in Southwark, to instruct the children of the poor. Enthusiastic in his calling, and benevolent to rashness in his disposition, he assumed towards his scholars more the character of guardian than of master; easily remitting to the poorer children even the scanty pittance charged, and often furnishing with food the most distressed. No wonder that his scholars multiplied with great rapidity: they numbered 90 ere he was 18 years old, and afterwards came pouring in upon him "like flocks of sheep," till in 1798, they reached as many as 1,000.'—*Census*, 1851, p. xv.

Lancaster, however, was not the man to carry on what he had originated; indeed, his whole career marks him as a thoroughly incompetent man.

'Ardent, visionary, destitute of worldly prudence, the very qualities which made him so successful as a teacher and a missionary in the cause of education, rendered him incapable as an administrator. His affairs became embarrassed: he himself was tossed about through varied troubles,

passing from a prison to prosperity, and then again reduced to bankruptcy; until, in 1818, he departed for America, where, after twenty years of suffering, brightened by some intervals of popularity but none of prudence, his life was terminated by an accident, in 1838, in the streets of New York.'—*Census*, 1851, p. xvi.

The prominent result of this unfortunate man's system when committed to abler hands, was the foundation in 1808, of 'The British and Foreign School Society,' called at first, 'The 'Royal Lancasterian Institution for Promoting the Education of 'the Children of the Poor.'

The monitorial system, which was the main feature of these schools, had been employed for some years by Dr. Bell, in the Military Orphan School at Madras. The following brief memoir of this distinguished name in the history of education, is worthy of attention.

'Andrew Bell was the very opposite of Joseph Lancaster, in all except a common enthusiasm for instruction on the "mutual" or "monitorial" system. A Scotchman, (the son of a barber of Saint Andrew's), his career was just as much distinguished by invariable prudence as was Lancaster's by constant though benevolent improvidence. On leaving college in 1774, at the age of twenty-one, Bell went to America, and spent his next five years as a tutor in Virginia, whence in 1781, he returned to England, having suffered shipwreck on his passage. He now took orders in the English Church, and became the minister of the Episcopal Chapel at Leith. Applying for a Doctor's degree in Divinity, he received instead, from the University of Saint Andrew's, one in Medicine. In 1787 he sailed for India, where he was appointed chaplain to five or six regiments. On the foundation of the Military Orphan Asylum, he became its honorary superintendent; and it was in this capacity that he made his experiment in "mutual instruction." The result of this experiment he published, after his return to England in 1797, and made strenuous efforts to procure the general adoption of his scheme. In 1801 he became rector of Swanage, Dorsetshire; in 1808 the master of Sherborne Hospital; in 1818 a prebendary of Hereford Cathedral, and subsequently one of Westminster. He died in 1832, bequeathing his large fortune of 120,000*l.* principally to the Educational Institutions of his native country. It is, however in connexion with the National Society that Dr. Bell is chiefly known.'—*Census*, 1851, p. xvi.

Since the establishment of the National Society in 1811, the Church has assumed a very prominent position in the education of the poor. Parliamentary returns were obtained in 1818, of the number of schools and scholars throughout the country, when the former amounted to 19,230 day, and 5,463 Sunday-schools; and the latter to 674,883 day, and 477,225 Sunday-scholars; the proportion of these to the population being 1 in 17 at day, and 1 in 24 at Sunday-schools. In 1833 similar returns were made out, and the numbers were respectively about doubled in day-schools, and nearly trebled in Sunday-schools; so that, although the population had increased nearly 24 per cent. in those 15 years, yet the proportion of scholars to

population was brought down to 1 in 11, and 1 in 9, instead of the proportion mentioned of the former period.

From the year 1833 are to be dated those annual government grants in aid of day-schools, the management of which, has been the cause of so much discussion. For six years a grant was made of 20,000*l.* and, for lack of any other plan of application, it was divided between the British and Foreign, and the National Societies, as representing the two great parties actively concerned in education. In 1839 some attempts were made to develope plans of state education; but the opposition that was met with, both from Churchmen and Dissenters, strongly brought out the fact, that education, in immediate connexion with different religious bodies, was more in favour with the public, than the direct agency of government. The duties of administering parliamentary grants were, at this time, transferred from the Treasury to the Committee of Privy Council on Education; the principle being also adopted of assisting, with the public money, the voluntary efforts of separate religious bodies, in proportion to their own exertions. The annual grants were also now increased; for three years they were 30,000*l.*, then 40,000*l.*; in 1845 they amounted to 75,000*l.*; for the two next years they were 100,000*l.*, in 1848-9-50, they came to 125,000*l.*; in 1851-2, to 150,000*l.*; and in 1853, to 260,000*l.* Of 500,000*l.* spent in England, between 1839 and 1850, almost entirely in the building of school-rooms, and the support of normal schools, it is satisfactory to the Church, that she, on the principle of distribution now adopted, obtained 405,000*l.*, while the Wesleyans only obtained 8,000*l.*, and the Roman Catholics 1,049. 51,000*l.* being given to the British and Foreign Society, leaving 37,000*l.* to Workhouse-schools, which, generally speaking, are under the influence of the clergy, and, therefore, may be considered Church schools.

The obvious importance which the system of state intervention now adopted gives to the education of the Church, in consequence of her own numerical majority, and her more complete organization, has excited much jealousy in some bodies of Dissenters, especially the Independents and Baptists, who, having formerly been the great advocates of state education—thinking thereby to undermine the influence of the Church—at once became its most rigid opponents, as soon as the result was proved to contradict their previous wishes. Various societies have sprung up, connected with these religious bodies, which have been the means of confirming more than ever the self-adopted principle of the English people, that the education of children shall be attached to the religious system of the country; and that, if the one is divided, the other shall be divided also.

The general result of all the activity which has been shown on the subject is sufficiently striking, when we find that, whereas in 1818 there was a day-scholar for every 17·25 persons of the whole population; and in 1833, one for every 11·27, there was in 1851, a scholar for every 8·36 persons. The increase between 1818 and 1851 was, of day-scholars, 218 per cent., and of Sunday-scholars, 404 per cent.; while the increase of population was but 54 per cent. How far we have accomplished what is requisite depends on other considerations, one of which is, whether the number of children now attending school is even yet as great as it should be.

What is the number, then, which, in a population of 17,927,609, ought to be found attending school? 1 in 8 is often assumed as a satisfactory proportion. This would amount to 2,240,951; and, on the supposition that all these were between the ages of 5 and 15, there might be, in this case, an average of 5 years at school for each child. When, however, we take into consideration, that many of the wealthier classes send their children to school for a much longer period, and that the poorer classes often send theirs at a younger age than 5, it follows that the average period of profitable schooling, *i.e.* between 5 and 15 years of age, among the poor, will be reduced considerably below 5 years, probably to 4 years. The deficiency shown in the present census below this assumed 1 in 8, is only 96,573; the actual number of scholars being that much below the 2,240,951. Mr. Horace Mann is not, however, satisfied with this abstract 1 in 8; he takes the whole population of England and Wales, and proceeds to find out, by a calculation of his own, how many ought to be at school.

Between the ages of 3 and 15 there are 4,908,696 children. Here, then, is the material out of which to make schools. About 1,000,000 of this number is at once disposed of, as being employed in various kinds of labour, manufacturing and agricultural; the permanently sick are reckoned at 195,000; those who are educated at home at 50,000; there are then left 3,663,261, between 3 and 15 years of age, who might be at school. As, however, the age between 3 and 5 is not of much profit at school, and as, therefore, it is not thought desirable to promote such early attendance beyond what is practically found to be the case, we have to deduct from this number all between those ages who are not actually at school or otherwise employed. This number is estimated at 574,611. Again, as attendance at school after 12 until 15, however desirable, is hardly to be expected among the working classes, we have to deduct also all between those ages, who, as before, are not actually at school or otherwise employed; estimated at 73,245. After all these deductions, the

residue is 3,015,405, or one-sixth of the population, consisting of all between 5 and 12 not kept from school by any sufficient cause, and all between 3 and 5, or 12 and 15, who are at present actually sent to school of free choice. This is the true number to be compared with the census return of 2,144,378, in order to judge whether the amount of our present educational plans are satisfactory or not. There is, then, a deficiency of no less than 970,000, which number of children are detained from school between the ages of 5 and 12. It does not, however, follow that these children never see a school, while all the rest, 2,000,000 and more, devote the whole 7 years to study. We must divide the time actually spent in school, in a fairer proportion, between the whole number. Mr. Mann's deduction is as follows:—

'If we have recourse to the opinions and experience of able writers and instructors on this point, the inference seems to be, that, while among the middle and upper classes the average time expended on their children's school-education is about six years, the average time amongst the labouring classes cannot much exceed four years. If this be so, the inference appears inevitable, that very few children are *completely* uninstructed; nearly all, at some time or another of their childhood, see the inside of a school-room, although some do little more. Upon no other supposition can the constant presence on the school books of the names of upwards of 2,000,000 children between three and fifteen, out of 4,908,696, be consistent with a brief school period for any considerable portion of the former number.'—*Census*, 1851, p. xxx.

No less a number, then, than 3,000,000 would be satisfactory, as representing the total children on the books of day-schools; especially when it is remembered that the actual attendance is somewhat irregular among the poor. Mr. Mann says, that in private schools the attendance, on an average, is 91 per cent. of the number on the books, while in public schools the per-centage is only 79. Even this, we think, hardly describes the extreme irregularity of attendance occasioned by the demand for youthful labour, at particular seasons of the year, in agricultural districts. The whole of the autumn, indeed, from the harvest to Christmas, is broken in upon, to the destruction of any real work, by the practice of using large gangs of children to dibble in the seed-corn, and to perform other processes of modern farming. From the beginning of August to January, the attendance of the elder school-children, in corn-growing countries, is so occasional and uncertain, that, with the commencement of every year, it is almost necessary to begin education afresh. This periodical irregularity hardly enters, we think, into the calculation of the census, which was taken at the very best time of the year,—in the middle of that seven months, from January to August, which is the great season or term for rustic education. The power of remedying these irregularities of day instruction by systematic

evening-schools is suggested, but not discussed, by Mr. Mann, as no inquiries of an efficient kind were instituted at the census. Indeed, the principle is not yet sufficiently developed for statistical information. Everything, however, points to the necessity of them, if the demand for youthful labour is continued, and, at the same time, the cause of education advances. What hope is there for the rising generation, if all education ceases at 10 or 11 years of age,—if from that time every kind of influence over them is lost, and all mental culture, as well as religious teaching, is left to chance, and to voluntary aspiration on the part of children themselves?

The next consideration touched on by Mr. Mann, is the quality of existing instruction in day-schools. Questions were asked as to the subjects taught in every school, and the number of children learning each. Any one who has had to do with the filling-up of such returns, will not place any very great reliance on the accuracy of the details that can be put together out of a country school; especially when 100 or so of little children have to be classified in almost as many different ways, and the brains of the teacher are confused by the multiplicity of questions. Still, however, some such details have been arrived at, which in the mass may probably be useful, especially in testifying to the small instruction given; for errors would be more likely to arise in overstating, than in understating, the amount of learning imparted. It appears that out of 33,993 boys'-schools from which information was obtained, there were 10,000 in which writing was not taught, and 20,000 in which geography was not taught. Again, out of 1,818,024 children of whom some details have been ascertained, it appears that 200,000 do not even learn to read, while nearly 800,000 do not learn to write, and 900,000, or one-half, do not learn arithmetic. About 30 per cent. learn grammar and geography, while other branches of learning fall to a per-centage that is wholly insignificant; for instance, modern and ancient languages, 4 per cent., and mathematics, 3 per cent.

Mr. Mann's deductions from this are very true:—

'To find in the schools a large proportion of the children learning the mere rudiments of knowledge, while a small proportion only is engaged upon the higher branches, must be looked upon as an unfavourable sign; revealing probably a limited duration of instruction—received, too, at an early age. And when it is remembered that, of those who appear to have been engaged in the more advanced departments of instruction, a majority were probably belonging to the upper and the middle classes, a preceding speculation seems to be corroborated, that the children of the working asses go to school while very young, and remain but for a very scanty riod.'—*Census*, 1851, p. xxxiii.

On the subject, however, of the *quality* of education, we must

consider the efficiency of the teacher as well as the age and regularity of the pupil. The standard of remuneration given is applied to a large number of teachers, as some means of estimating the value of their services. The counties of Lancaster and Lincoln were selected for special inquiries under this head. In the former county, an average being taken of 301 masters, their salary per annum amounts to 58*l.* each; of 275 mistresses, the average is 31*l.* There are also, in boys'-schools, 132 paid monitors, with an average of 9*l.* 10*s.* each, and in girls'-schools 275, with 6*l.* 16*s.* each. In Church of England schools, the average pay of masters is also 58*l.*, the same as the average of all others. The masterships under the head of military schools help to lower the average, being only 18*l.*, which needs probably some explanation. Union workhouses only give 46*l.*, considerably below the average. Independents are more liberal, giving 81*l.* Quakers and Unitarians give more than 70*l.*, and Methodists 63*l.* Smaller religious sects and ragged-schools, &c. give less than the average, the lowest sum put down being 33*l.* The same relative proportions apply, without much alteration, to mistresses in this country. In Lincolnshire the average pay of masters generally is 74*l.*, but the higher standard is made up by collegiate and grammar schools, the pay of masters in national schools averaging only 50*l.*, and in other Church schools only 28*l.* Wesleyan Methodists in this county average 61*l.*, and British schools 78*l.* Mistresses in this county receive an average of 24*l.*, which is also much lower than in Lancashire.

Questions about remuneration are doubtless more difficult to get answered correctly than any other. In the first place, there is always jealousy, on the part of trustees and managers, to name the exact amount, even if they are able, especially where the school is in private hands, or maintained, perhaps, by a single individual; and in the second place, there are often various arrangements, with regard to the children's pence, or the residence of the master, or the amalgamation of his school duties with other parochial offices, which make it difficult to estimate with any exactness what his total income may be. It would, however, seem to be ascertained, that masters are better paid in manufacturing than in rural districts, and that they share in the general advance of wages which distinguish the one from the other. It is, however, fair to state that little dependence can be placed on these comparative tables of income, drawn up by Mr. Mann, as it appears on inspection that only 18 masters of parochial schools in the whole county of Lincoln sent in returns which he was able to use on this subject, a fact which completely destroys any statistical use of the table, though it may suggest speculations that in all probability the average of 50*l.* which

ought to furnish equal proportions. It appears that the deficiency, at the census, was less in the case of boys than of girls; there were 13·2 per cent. of boys, and only 10·8 of girls. Nor is this proportion altered more than about one-tenth per cent., if scholars *at home* are included. Girls, therefore, are less educated than boys, and 600,000 of the whole number of unexplained cases of absence would be of this sex. Again, it is asked whether every locality should furnish an equal proportion of scholars. The larger and more constant demand for youthful labour in manufacturing districts, makes the proportion in them somewhat less than in agricultural counties. The per-centage varies, in England, from about 15 to 9 per cent, South Wales being still lower, only 8·6 per cent. The city of York and Westmoreland are the only places in which the 15 is exceeded. Hertford, Huntingdon, Rutland, Southampton, have 14. Berkshire, Cambridge, Cumberland, Dorset, Kent, Oxford, Sussex, Wilts, and the East and North Ridings of Yorkshire, have 13. Chester, Derby, Durham, Essex, Gloucester, Leicester, Lincoln, Norfolk, Northampton, Northumberland, Somerset, Suffolk, Surrey, and the West Riding of Yorkshire have 12. Buckingham, Devon, Nottingham, Salop, and Worcester, have 11. Bedford, Cornwall, Lancaster, Middlesex, Stafford, Warwick, have 10; while Hereford and Monmouth are the only counties which supply to day-schools only 9 per cent. of their population.

Various causes are discussed, to account for the deficiency in the number of children under the process of education. The want of school accommodation is not to be alleged as any excuse, for there is in very many places a redundancy, while in others the deficiency could easily be supplied, if there was any real anxiety for more room. Nor, again, is the school fee any very powerful barrier, even to the working classes, as may be seen by the little more concern taken in education, even where such fee, of a penny or twopence a-week, is not required. Much, however, of the absence from school which has to be deplored, exists in classes by no means the poorest; and when 50,000,000*l.* is annually spent by the labouring classes in strong drinks, it is justly imagined, that poverty is not the principal hindrance to the efficient education of children. The grand cause for the absence of children from school is the indifference of parents; so at least says Mr. Mann. He regrets the want of ambition in parents to give their children such an education as may enable them to improve their position in life. Nor does he confine this spirit to the lowest classes:—

'In general a parent, in whatever station, takes himself and his own social *status* as the standard up to which he purposes to educate his

offspring: the nobility, the gentry, merchants, tradesmen, artizans, and agricultural labourers expect to see their children occupying just the same positions as themselves, and not unnaturally seek to qualify them for no higher duties. Hence it is that only those whose after-life is destined to be spent in intellectual exercises, as the pastime of an affluent leisure, or the subject-matter of professional activity, prolong their educational career beyond the elementary school period. The children of the mercantile community are thought to have completed their instruction when they have become adapted for the counting-house; the sons of tradesmen when they have been fitted for apprentices; the sons of all engaged in manual industry as soon as they possess the manual strength and skill required for such pursuits.'—*Census*, 1851, p. xli.

The history of English society, for the last half-century, scarcely bears out this accusation; for perhaps a time has never existed, when there has been a greater amount of successful ambition of the kind here spoken of,—ambition which has used education as its chief instrument. The principal cause of regret is, we think, that mental culture is not valued for its own sake, as giving opportunities of moral advancement and of recreation to all classes;—it is only valued as a means of rising from a lower to a higher sphere, not as an instrument of improving the tastes and habits of each class as it at present exists. Yet, in spite of this, we cannot but concur, to some extent, with Mr. Mann's passing sneer at the tutoring which the labouring classes have, for some generations, been diligently subjected to, 'not to look beyond their station.' If station in life is a fixed thing, one great stimulus to education is certainly wanting, however we might desire that mental cultivation should be aimed at for its own sake.

Among the remedies proposed for the present indifference to education, Mr. Mann lays much stress on the importance of secondary education,—that is, of more opportunities than now exist for making use, in after-life, of what has been learnt in childhood:—

'If, after reading and writing have been mastered, more inducements could be offered for the frequent application of these arts in daily life, unquestionably fewer persons would be found unable, as at present, after some few years of manhood have elapsed, to read intelligibly, or to sign the marriage register except with marks. It is the goal in view that stimulates to perseverance in a tiresome course; but at present it must be, I fear, confessed, the working classes have no satisfactory reward to look to as the honourable end of their exertions. Much, no doubt, is now in process of accomplishment, for giving them increased facilities for gaining information; and mechanics' institutions, reading clubs, and, lately, borough libraries, have been established; but, in spite of these and other efforts, the extent to which the labouring multitudes are found engaged in intellectual recreation is surprisingly and sadly insignificant.'—*Census*, 1851, pp. xli, xlii.

Without any object, or ultimate use before it, Mr. Mann considers the elementary school to be 'little better than a *cul de*

sac.' At the same time it is most needful to improve the general character and system of primary schools, if only as a means of inducing children to prolong their stay, and thus of gaining more hold over their future tastes and habits. But in any improvement which is to be attempted, there comes the question of finance, which is thus introduced:

'Sir James Kay Shuttleworth computes that to provide an education of the character contemplated by the Minutes of 1846, for 1,836,562 scholars in public schools of religious bodies, would require a total annual sum of 2,890,845*l.* (exclusive of the cost of new school *buildings*); or an *increase*, on the present annual expenditure, of 1,844,265*l.* No question can exist that, whatsoever be the standard of efficiency to which it may be deemed desirable to raise the public schools, a very heavy further outlay, both for new erections and for annual support, will be required. And scarcely less will be the outlay necessary to establish and sustain those further institutions for promoting *secondary* education, without which the extension of mere primary instruction cannot be of much avail.'—*Census*, 1851, p. xliii.

The consideration of the means that might be necessary to arrive at any given standard, naturally brings Mr. Mann to the subject of the educational agencies that already exist. Hitherto he has dwelt mainly on schools and scholars in the mass, but now he divides them into their several species and kinds. The two chief points of interest to which we would now direct attention, in this subdivision, are the education of the middle classes, and the comparative influence of the Church among other religious bodies.

On the former point, Mr. Mann estimates that about 500,000 children, of the middle and upper classes, attend private schools. To these he adds 50,000, from the same classes, who attend public and grammar schools. On the supposition that these classes supply one-fourth of the whole number of children in the country, it is estimated that the children belonging to them have on an average 5½ years of schooling. As, however, a further number of 50,000 receive instruction of a regular kind, under tutors and governesses at home, this average may be stated at 6 years. Calculations of this kind are, of course, based on suppositions, about which there may be various opinions in matters of fact. What authority, for instance, is there for naming one-fourth of the population, as the proportion belonging to the middle and upper classes, and, therefore, as supplying the 500,000, who are found to attend the better class of private schools? The average of 6 years, calculated in this way, for the children of the upper and middle classes, may not, therefore, be sufficient evidence, on which to found a positive charge of neglect, because it falls short of the 8 years that has generally been assumed to be the proper average of school attendance for these classes; yet, when it is remembered that,

in this estimate are included the upper classes and the wealthier of the middle, as well as the great mass of tradesmen and farmers,—and when it is granted, as we think it must be, that the former are, on the whole, well and sufficiently educated,—the average is probably far too low for the very large and important class of society which constitutes the latter. There is very little doubt, also, that the *quality* of middle class education is as deficient as the *quantity*. The following conclusion we, therefore, consider most just and true: 'Good schools, on 'reasonable terms, for children of the middle classes, are perhaps 'more needed than new national or British schools.'

The want of such schools has long been felt, and successful efforts have been made, in some measure, to supply them. The greater number of endowed and grammar schools were intended by their founders to assist this class, but, from mismanagement, they have been too much appropriated, either by the rich on the one side, or by the purveyors of the most elementary instruction, on the other. Lord Brougham has estimated the value of endowments for education at 500,000*l.* a year; indeed there are as many as 4,021 schools, which are either wholly or partially maintained by endowments. In some cases the endowments are very small, amounting only to 5*l.*, and 904 of the above total number are between 20*l.* and 50*l.*; but even these, with special arrangements for the purpose, would form centres for other contributions, and for schools mainly self-supporting, far beyond what is now the case. There are, however, as many as 60 with endowments from 500*l.* to above 2,000*l.* a year, which, if not bound to local restrictions, could be applied with immense advantage to the general improvement of middle class education. No class is in more need of that particular guidance and assistance which endowed schools can give, than are small tradesmen and farmers. The education of the poorest classes is now acknowledged to form part of the parochial system, or of the efforts of the present generation in some form or other. Let it so continue, and let not the existence of endowments be made a pretext for saving the pockets of those, who otherwise would feel it incumbent on them to supply education for the poor of their neighbourhood. They were left not to relieve property of any just responsibility, but to assist children in obtaining a certain amount and kind of education which otherwise would not be supplied.

Mr. Mann thinks that the present tendency of education is towards centralization in large schools, without much intermixture of classes; each class, in fact, gathering together in large numbers. The old system of grammar schools was, no doubt, the very opposite to this; there was usually in them a

great mixture of classes from one locality. The facility of travelling and other reasons, would now, it seems, make it more popular to have schools composed of one class from many localities. The great object, however, being to aid good education in any way, we must be content to waive the question, whether the intermixture of classes is socially beneficial, and we must aid the plan which seems to be the natural tendency of the public mind. One consideration, however, naturally occurs as resulting from this change of educational prejudices; which is, that in any readjustment of school charities, at the hand of the Charitable Trust Commissioners, local restrictions should be permitted to have less sway, otherwise many schools will lose a great part of their usefulness, and be practically confined, not only to one locality, but one limited class of society in that locality.

It is always to be regretted when accidental restrictions, that were part of the natural system of a past age, and which, therefore, were introduced to foster the work of education as then conducted, should be actual impediments in the present age, because they militate against certain popular habits that are the natural growth of circumstances. Would it then be to take too much liberty with the letter of founders' wills, (we feel sure it would not be with their intentions,) to convert grammar schools into central middle schools, or even to amalgamate several foundations into one, in certain limits, and by this means establish good middle schools, such as, without being perfectly free, could yet afford to give a better education, under the management of better masters, than the payment of the scholars would allow? Schools, we think, might thus be founded, which would gain great favour with the class for whom they were meant.

Grammar schools, as at present managed, may be cheap for day-boys living in the immediate neighbourhood, but for boarders, where such are taken in, the terms are far too high to admit small tradesmen's sons; for it has been the universal aim of such schools to obtain gentlemen's sons only for boarders, who are supposed to make up, by high payments, for the smallness of the endowment. The result is, that the town boys are handed over to an inferior usher, while the better qualified head-master either does nothing, or in no way benefits that particular class whose efforts for a good education it is so desirable to encourage, and to help which was undoubtedly the object of the founders. This system is indeed much destroyed already, by the unwillingness of gentlemen to send their sons to any small grammar schools.

The centralizing principle, which has raised the large public

schools, has, in one sense, ruined small ones; surely then let these last find, in their present supposed decay, an urgent call to meet a pressing want in the lower middle classes. Let them throw themselves into the system of the age, and be the local centres of middle education in their several counties, as Eton and Harrow are the centres of a higher class, through the whole country.

In large towns it will still be compatible with this object, to retain the system of day-scholars in connexion with such endowments, for the population is all at hand. Much good also has been done of late, in making town grammar schools really useful to the middle classes. King Edward's School, in Birmingham, is a noble instance of the practical carrying out of this work: Every morning there pour in through its gateway about 400 town boys, sons of tradesmen, who there receive a free education from highly educated university men. There are also about twice that number in other schools, situated in different parts of the town, but supported by the same foundation. In rural districts, however, it would be necessary to establish cheap boarding-houses in connexion with such schools, as there would not be a sufficient number of boys, within daily reach of it, to take full advantage of its usefulness. By this means the sons of small farmers and country tradesmen might, at a comparatively small expense, perhaps not much exceeding 20*l.*, receive a really sound education, under circumstances far more advantageous than any at present enjoyed.

There is no class so little able to choose proper means of education, as those slightly removed from the lower. Nothing is supplied to them in an official and natural manner, as parish schools are supplied to the poor, and, therefore, they often give their children a sort of inferior home or day-school education, with an occasional quarter at a small private boarding school, about the character of which they know but little. These second-rate private boarding schools are, generally speaking, neither cheap enough, nor good enough, for the purpose (or we should have no wish to interfere with them); they are not cheap enough to retain scholars for any great length of time, and they are not good enough to impart any improved tone into the class of society that feeds them. Yet nothing is so desirable as to encourage boarding schools for this class. Boys are by their means taken out of reach of home prejudices, and of the faults which are but too common, in the every-day affairs of life, among the striving and somewhat worldly class of small traders. A higher tone of moral training can thus be imparted, than is possible in the short visits of a day-school. The mind is enlarged by intercourse with others of the same age, and the

conceits of a little shopkeeper's or publican's boy, (which are great, in the home neighbourhood, over the more humble labourer's son,) are brought to their proper level in that great tussle of school life, which a large school prefigures as the best preparation for the trials of manhood.

The ignorance of this class is at present universally acknowledged; and any clergyman who has prepared much for confirmation will have discovered, that the pupils of the parish school far exceed, in religious knowledge, the sons and daughters of the classes above them; who come, nevertheless, with the air of persons that are conferring an immense favour on a clergyman by condescending to be examined by him in common with the children of the poor. Middle class life, as such, is immersed in the cares of business, thinks only of what produces an immediate return of tangible worldly advantage, and, therefore, its whole atmosphere is the worst possible for the training of youth. Yet this is the class which is said to constitute the strength of a community like that of England. It is the active, rising, and energetic element which creates the wealth and supports the power of the country, nay, even governs the House of Commons. Of what vast importance, then, it is to provide good education for this class, is obvious. Everything that can be done to facilitate this end, ought to be adopted as a national good, not only for the sake of benefiting the individuals. For this reason, we think that foundation and grammar schools, where not left with other express injunctions—as they were originally intended for the lower middle class—should now also be so managed as most to aid them in providing good education for their children. They are specially capable, we think, of forming the common ground, on which the necessity for cheap middle education can meet the highest class of instructors, and on which the work can be conducted upon the highest principles of moral and intellectual training.

Unaided private enterprise has, however, begun this great work, and already shown that, whether the old foundations of the country can, or cannot, be freely engrafted into the educational spirit of the age, middle class cheap schools, conducted by men of the highest university distinction, are a clear want of the age, and, as such, are in process of being supplied. Hurstpierpoint is the most striking instance in point; we have not at hand the details of this establishment, but, from all we know, it answers in every way to the idea we have marked out. In many other counties the same plan is being adopted, with more or less success, sometimes in connexion with agricultural colleges, and sometimes as general schools, without any special object. There is no class of English society more in need of educational and social improvement than this, and there

are no means so likely to conduce to these ends, as the partial introduction of a collegiate system to the training of their children.

The present use made of endowed schools may be gathered, in some measure, from one of the numerous tables which Mr. Mann has worked out. He divides endowed schools into collegiate and grammar schools, and other endowed schools. Under the former head it would appear that the highest kind of instruction is given, denoting that they are reserved for the higher classes. Ancient languages are taught in 71 out of every hundred, and mathematics in 67; while, under the latter head, ancient languages drop down to 7 per cent., and geography only numbers 51 per cent., thus signifying a very low standard of education imparted. Endowments seem thus divided between the high and low, while the middle classes have but little share in them. Surely this is just the reverse of what it ought to be; and, therefore, we would suggest that the Charity Commissioners, whatever their power may be, which seems a doubtful question, should, at any rate as long as they act at all, direct their attention to the best way of using the endowments for the benefit of that lower middle class, for whom we think they were generally meant.[1]

That very many of our school endowments were intended for the middle classes, we think may be gathered, in some measure, from the date of their foundation. The last century produced no fewer than 1,334 of such endowments. Now, during that time popular education was hardly known; learning was thought of as the means of making a good apprentice, and of finally becoming Lord Mayor of London. Social elevation was the grand idol of the century, and in not a few memorable cases did the noble struggles of youth to obtain some share of learning, end in successful wealth and rank. Is it not, then, most probable that those endowments were meant to assist these efforts after social advancements, rather than to give the first elements of reading and writing to the very poorest. It is, indeed, specially provided for in many founders' wills, that children shall not be admitted into the benefit of the endowment till they know the first rudiments of learning, such as plain reading and writing.

Attempts have been made, in some parts of the country, to bring the children of the lower middle classes into the same school with the poor, charging them a higher fee, and giving them some few advantages. By this means, it has been hoped

[1] In consequence of some fault in the Act of Parliament, the Charity Commissioners are now obliged to make the humiliating confession, that they are not empowered to enforce the recommendation. We hope this will speedily be remedied.

that parish schools might be self-supporting. Mr. Kennedy, however, Inspector of Schools, strongly condemns this plan, as injurious to the interests of both, and opposed to the feelings of the middle class. He is not unconscious of the wants of this class, but he would supply them in other ways. His remarks are so much to the point that we extract them from the Minutes of the Committee of Council on Education, for 1853–4, just published:

'Though I have deprecated the proposal of throwing open our national schools for the poor for the reception of the children of tradespeople, who can afford to pay higher school fees, I desire to add, that I am fully alive to the importance of the education of the middle classes, and of there being better schools for them than there are. What is wanted for the children of the small shopkeepers and skilled artizans is the converse of what is now needed for the poorer classes. Religious zeal, aided by the Parliamentary grant, has provided school-buildings for the poor, and there is a tolerable supervision of such schools; what they want is proper sustentation. Whereas, I have no doubt but that the lower middle classes would duly support good schools for their children; and their great want is suitable buildings and proper supervision. It appears to me that it would be a very great boon to these classes, and to the country, if the Committee of Council on Education would help them, not to support their schools, but simply to acquire suitable buildings, requiring the right of inspection as the condition of the grant towards the school-buildings.'—*Minutes*, pp. 756, 757.

Partial success has, nevertheless, attended the plan of mingling classes, and in some places there is no choice for farmers and tradesmen, who must either send their children to the national school or nowhere. The kind of separation, however, that is often allowed, sometimes absolutely marked by a curtain, is adverse to good discipline, and to the growth of right feeling. Except, therefore, in the case of very young children, it would certainly be productive of much good education, if all those classes, who can pay for their own schooling, should be provided with middle schools, and that, where possible, the children of this class should be trained up away from the associations of home.

It is time, however, that we now turn to the question of what influence the Church possesses in the present educational movement. Mr. Mann speaks with enthusiasm of 'the inexhaustible resources and illimitable enterprises of religious zeal;' he continues to state that 'This insatiable benevolence has 'almost wholly reared, and is now in greater part sustaining, 'upwards of 10,000 day-schools, in which more than 1,000,000 'children of the poorer classes are from day to day instructed.'

It is a natural object of regret that the good work of education should be the battle-field for sectarian oppositions. Her Majesty's Inspectors evidently repine over the great hindrances thereby caused to the establishment of a more effective machinery.

How simple, for instance, would it be, to improve the education of any given town, if all parents in it were agreed on religious questions? There might then (a want which is much felt) be schools for different ages and degrees of proficiency; and the superior children might thus be assembled together from various smaller districts, and receive an education from such a well-qualified master as might perhaps be obtainable at the scale of one to each town, but cannot be had in every small parish or sect. At present, each parish and sect must begin and finish with all their pupils, and have a complete organization in itself. There is no cooperation, or division of labour, according to the qualifications of respective masters. The loss thereby incurred must, however, be endured with philosophy. These inconveniences form part of the data on which we have to act; the very causes of them are also the stimulants for much of the voluntary assistance which is obtained. If, therefore, the agents of government education, enraged, as they may justly be, with the folly of local disagreements, that cause so much waste of funds, and so much embarrassment of plans, should attempt to ride over these prejudices, they will, we fear, discover that voluntary aid is in a great measure withdrawn; and that they are no longer able to cooperate in a friendly spirit with the undoubted tendencies of the age on the subject of education.

The country is in fact now smarting for its religious divisions. We have boasted of toleration and freedom of opinion, and of the inestimable value of religious liberty. We do not question the soundness of the national judgment in wishing for these advantages, only let it be remembered that, if we are divided, we can no longer enjoy the many facilities and conveniences which are the reward of unity.

'The extent,' Mr. Mann says, 'to which religious bodies are 'assuming the control of popular education is continually and 'rapidly increasing.' Within the last ten years, no fewer than 4,604 school-buildings have been raised by religious bodies, which educate, probably, about 450,000 scholars; and the total voluntary contributions to schools of this nature are calculated at about 400,000*l.*

The number of schools under the head of Religious Denominations is 10,595, excluding schools, in which any endowment they may have is greater than the voluntary subscriptions of their conductors; and, with these, 12,708. The scholars belonging to this last number of schools are 1,188,786; and as the scholars are the real objects of interest, we shall take this number as the one by which to judge of the relative influence of different religious bodies. The whole number, then, of scholars under this head, is reckoned at 1,188,786, and of these the Church of *England* has no less than 929,474. The next largest number

down this column, is one of 780,597, belonging to British schools, not returned as being connected with any particular denomination. The residue, therefore, for all definite sects of Dissenters, is only 176,715. Of this the Independents have 50,000; the Methodists, 44,000; the Roman Catholics, 41,000; Baptists, 9,000; Unitarians, 4,000; Quakers, 3,000; and other smaller sects, numbers varying from 2,000 to 15.

The striking feature of this list is the great preponderance of Church schools, yet Mr. Mann seems chiefly to gather from it, with assumed official impartiality, that 'popular education is rapidly becoming a matter of *denominational* activity.' How this activity is henceforth to be conducted, is nevertheless a difficult question to answer, when the Church's share in the work is plainly stated; and Mr. Mann appears then almost to tremble for religious liberty, for he sees no probability of Dissenting bodies being, each of them, able to provide day-schools in every place. 'It even seems inevitable,' he says, 'at first sight, 'that, in the course of time, the mass of the population must 'gradually return to the Church of England.' Yet he consoles himself with the reflections that still linger in his memory, from the census of religious worship, and remarks, that if Church schools do educate four-fifths of the population, yet after the children are grown up, they alter this proportion between Church and Dissent to an equality of numbers. There is something like a sneer in the following sentence, which follows the notice of these facts.

'This appears to prove, that either the education given by the Church has been administered on very tolerant and liberal principles, or else the sectarian and doctrinal instruction of the day-school is extremely ineffective in comparison with those religious influences which the scholar meets elsewhere.'—*Census*, 1851, p. liv.

As might naturally be expected, the proportion of children in Church schools is greater throughout rural districts, and less in towns; for in them each sect has a better opportunity of setting up a school for itself. In Birmingham, the proportion to the population attending Church day-schools, is only 2·67 per cent., while in Wiltshire, it is 7·27. Still the great fact remains, that the Church is the instructor of the poorer classes; and that the National Society, together with Government grants and voluntary cooperation, are the vast engines by which the rising generation of the masses are now receiving their education. With regard even to the nominal share taken by Dissenters in this national work, Mr. Matthew Arnold, Her Majesty's Inspector of British, Wesleyan and Denominational Schools, for the Midland districts of England and Wales, makes, in his recent report, the following important disclosure, which proves how

little that share is; and which still further strengthens the position that the Church is the teacher of the *Masses.*

'Nevertheless, while more and more convinced that the present elementary schools sufficiently educate the children who frequent them, and while more and more convinced that the central institutions sincerely desire to promote the education of the poor, I remain in the opinion which I last year expressed, that in the schools which I visit, and above all, in the Wesleyan schools which I visit, the children of the actually lowest, poorest classes in this country, of what are called the masses, are not, to speak generally, educated; that the children who are educated in them belong to a different class from these; and that, consequently, of the education of the masses, I, in the course of my official duty, see, strictly speaking, little or nothing.'—*Minutes*, p. 1046.

Roman Catholic schools would seem to form an exception to this exclusive principle of Dissent. Mr. Marshall, Inspector of these schools, relates the following instance as occurring in his experience.

'I remember assisting, nearly five years ago, at an examination of some of the older girls, conducted by the accomplished superioress of the celebrated school at Kinsale, which lasted two or three hours, during which a considerable portion of the historical parts of the Old Testament was illustrated by references to contemporaneous profane history, and this with an intelligent accuracy which I was able to admire and appreciate, but certainly could not have imitated. And the children who displayed this remarkable knowledge belonged, I think with one exception, to the very poorest class of Irish labourers. It is true that they had almost all been brought up from infancy in the Kinsale school.'—*Ibid.* p. 1165.

This gentleman's report of Roman Catholic schools is, in other respects, so much in their praise, that, at the risk of startling some Protestant ears, by the contemplation of a Government Inspector thus speaking of the teaching of Popery, we extract the following from the Minutes—how much abatement from its glowing eulogy will be made by such of our readers as remember that its author is 'a recent' and enthusiastic 'convert,' we shall not decide.

'Of these it would certainly be more accurate to say, that never was a more efficient system of education developed, either in England or elsewhere. Others will present the testimony gathered by their own experience; for myself, I am bound to report, that I have visited many schools, in compliance with the instructions conveyed to me, in which the teaching, comparing it, as far as I am able, with whatever I have seen, either here or in other countries, is admirable in its intellectual character, and of which, nevertheless, this is the least merit. I do not know what standard of excellence people propose to themselves when they speak of what elementary schools *ought* to be; but I am sure that I have visited some, which, whether as respects the nature and amount of the instruction, the discipline and formation of character, or the building up of definite, abiding, and vigorous religious faith and religious practice, neither are nor can be *surpassed* in Europe.'—*Ibid.* p. 1169.

The impression that we should wish to see derived from this is, that the Roman Catholics possess their great power in

schools, because they are a religious body, and work as such. Feeling that they are on their trial in this country, they strive in all they do to put forward their religious character in the most prominent manner; and working with an outwardly marked religious system, they make it their steady aim to gain a permanent hold on the minds of children. They have an unusual stimulus just now, and, therefore, we would suggest that their success is to be traced, not to the specialities of their own system, but generally, to the force of definite religious education, conducted by zealous and well-trained religious instructors.

The Church of England has an immense power now in her hands, and also needs an unusual stimulus to enable her to take advantage of the opportunity. It is a reflection, however, of no small importance, that, as yet, her education does not retain scholars in her communion through after-life. The census of religious worship has, we have no doubt, been 'cooked,' and made to exaggerate the numbers of Dissent. Still, it is a fact that children come to Church schools for their education, and are not retained in her communion afterwards. They turn to Dissent, or to careless ways, and seem, a large proportion of them, to have received (most truly) no *sectarian bias* from the teaching of the Church, such as will attach them to her. As Mr. Mann gives but little information beyond figures, and as the general facts expressed by the figures seem plain enough, in this part of our subject, we propose to consult the report of the Government Inspectors for further hints and information, that may throw light on the present educational position of the Church of England.

Mr. Mann may call the part which is taken by the Church of England in education, *denominational*, or *sectarian*, but the fact is, that while different sects and parties select out of the whole mass of the population particular objects on which to devote their instructive energies, the Church of England has to undertake, not only her own hearty members, but all who are left behind by others, all those whom nobody else cares to entice, and all those whose parents most obstinately hang back from any willing cooperation in the work of teaching. That the Church of England is the national educator seems to be as freely acknowledged by Dissenters as by others, especially when it suits their purpose. We know an instance, where a Dissenter ignorantly asserted, that he had a right to send his boy to the Church day-school, in spite of the well-grounded refusal of the clergyman, because it was a *national* school, and, therefore, open to the whole *nation*. Such, then, being the case, we find that Church schools labour under great difficulties in their religious

training and teaching. The managers of a Church school may, on their part, consider their services as the work of the Church, but the mass of the people persist in looking on their schools as part of a national institution. The difficulty, then, of the Church is to maintain her acknowledged position as instructor of the poor, and also to preserve her distinctive religious teaching, or, if Mr. Mann prefers the word, her denominational character; and, to do this, if possible, in such a way as to retain her scholars in her communion after they are grown up to man's estate. Facts, at present, show that she does not succeed in this, as a whole; although particular instances, where her religious claims are strongly and practically put before the youthful mind, show that she has the power, if she does but exercise it. Her special difficulties arise from her large grasp, comprehending all shades of opinion and character; which bring out, to the disappointment of her plans, so great a variety of hindrances, either from indifference or direct opposition. The condition, therefore, of Church of England schools must not be judged of, as if they were specimens of what the Church, as a religious body, is able to do; but the special difficulties she has to encounter—tending so much to bring prominently out on the surface of her schools the chief national faults with regard to education—must be well considered at the same time that any criticisms are made on the actual value of what she does. We have, in short, to look on her schools as exemplifying the national character, quite as much as her own inclinations and sentiments.

It is, indeed, owing to the national indifference on the whole subject of education, that the work of the Church, situated as she is, does not accomplish her ends with more certainty; but as she does practically fail in many things, which it is much to be desired that she should accomplish, it is vain and useless to flatter Churchmen with a mere enumeration of so many hundred thousand children whom the Church is educating, without at the same time stating what the inspection of these schools brings to light. The presumption, already stated in connexion with the bare facts of the Census, that the large and promising numbers are too much composed of the irregular attendance of very little children, is strongly confirmed by the Inspectors, who all complain most bitterly of the very early age at which the children of the poor leave school for ever. Mr. Bellairs, Inspector for Gloucester, Oxford, &c. says:—

> With reference to the different obstacles in our way, the most important
> e removal of children from school at a very early age. The complaints
> is head are as heavy and numerous as ever; boys and girls, in many
> nces, being taken away at 10, 9, and even 8 years of age. The evil of

this is very great. The boy removed from school at tender age leaves as an animal machine—his knowledge limited, his intelligence unawakened, and therefore his conscience, to a great extent, unenlightened. He commences and pursues life with little to guide him, save strong animal instincts and propensities. Intellectual pleasures, and the sweets of moral self-control, are to him unknown. His work is mere machinery; he is incapable of realizing the "why and the wherefore" in his daily occupations; his gratifications are sensual; his pleasures low and degrading. He goes to Church unable to follow the prayers, or to understand the sermon; his Bible, if able to read it, is to him, from his low intelligence and attainments, almost a sealed book. The wonders and goodness of God, as seen in creation, unfelt and unseen; and so life runs on, until at length, without provision for old age, or enlightened preparation for death, he becomes an inmate of the poor house, ere long to sink into his grave.'—*Minutes*, pp. 400, 401.

Mr. Cook, Inspector for Middlesex, &c. finds an improvement in this respect, inasmuch as there is a per-centage of almost 19 in his district who are above 12 years of age. This improvement, however, is not, he says, what ought to satisfy any friend of education. He suggests that it would be expedient to offer some inducements to the elder children to remain in school. Mr. Watkins' report is concluded with the following remarks:—

'This tender age of school children is the real educational evil—the giant mischief to which all others are mere dwarfs. It is, of course, well to attempt to do away with them; for, as they are removed, they show the monster evil more plainly, and, probably, in some degree, facilitate the approach to its removal also. But of this I am convinced, that no system of national education, which not only does not aim at, but, does not secure, the attendance of older children than those now at work in our schools, does anything really for the social or moral or religious progress of the country. The advocate of a purely secular system finds his stronghold here. He can point to the state of the country, and ask with triumph, —Where are the results of your religious education? It is quite true that they are mournfully small and unsatisfactory. But can anybody, who knows what child-nature is, and what are the ages of school-children, be surprised at this, or rationally expect more from the ever-shifting, almost infantine, population of elementary schools?'—*Ibid.* p. 494.

Mr. Douglas Tinling thus disparagingly reports of some schools in the Western counties:—

'With regard to many of the smaller schools, I regret to state that it is impossible to realize that any great work is going on for good, either in moral and religious training, or in the simplest elements of school instruction.

'The outward building stands as an acknowledgment of the necessity of the work, but the internal condition of the school shows that real education is not progressing.'—*Minutes*, pp. 561, 562.

The report of the Midland counties from Mr. Blandford is very explicit:—

'The average age at which the children leave these schools is under ten years. Very few, not more than three per cent., remain till they are

fourteen; and only four per cent. continue over four years under instruction, their place being supplied by a constant succession of new-comers. The discouragement thus caused to a hard working conscientious teacher may easily be imagined, whilst to one who is the reverse, and only anxious to keep up the numbers of the school, it affords a ready excuse for idleness and inattention to duty.'—*Ibid.* p. 669.

Mr. Norris, Inspector for Cheshire, &c. informs us, that out of every 100 children under his inspection, he does not consider that more than 6 or 7 stay long enough to profit by their education. Nor would there seem, from Mr. Stewart's report of the Northern counties, to be much difference in the time allowed for education, between manufacturing and agricultural districts. He does not enter into the question of how many per cent. stay a given time at school; but he opens the veil on those children who are not under his official inspection, and accounts for their absence. His picture may be overdrawn, and certainly is an exceptional one; but it is an important fact worth recording, that a Government inspector of the 19th century should thus have to write:—

'If factory labour is so oppressive to the young as to awaken the paternal sympathies of Governments, surely a much keener jealousy ought to protect the mere infants that totter forth into the fields, with a dry crust of mouldy bread, to earn a few pence for a famished family by scaring birds. I have known children so worn out by this employment that they have crawled home at night-fall merely to die.'—*Ibid.* pp. 903, 904.

These extracts from the report of her Majesty's Inspectors may represent the dark side of the picture; but yet they are explicit and comprehensive, especially when we take into consideration that they apply, with increased force, to that whole class of children whose fate we are now discussing, *i.e.* the poorest, because those few who do remain till a later age, are probably the children not of this class, but of one a little better off.

It is, no doubt, the tendency of inspectors to require too much, and to be hasty in condemning that education, as utterly useless, which does not come up to their standard. Allowances must be made for the short time that popular education has really been attempted, and for the slowness with which the subject is even yet taken up by the great monied interests of the country; but still the work needs a constant stimulant, and those who have the practical management of schools in their hands, must maintain an ideal standard before them, far higher than the actual present working of the educational system. Without further stimulating—and that from powerful quarters—there is yet a chance of the cause falling back, and of the effort to teach the English poor proving abortive. Mr. Mann illustrates the present mode in which the life of childhood passed from 3 to 15, by an ingenious coloured diagram, which,

at a glance up the several columns, exhibits the proportion at every age; of those who are scholars; of those who are employed; of those who are undescribed; and of those who are gradually departing altogether from mundane occupations after the commencement of their fourth year. From 3 to 6 the 'undescribed' predominate; but after that age the scholars, who have rapidly been increasing each year, gain a considerable advantage, arriving, however, at their climax before the age of 8 years. At this point the coloured portion that represents employment, and which is just discernible as a faint line for the two former years, begins to encroach on the scholars, at a much greater rate than it does on the undescribed. After 10 the scholars sink down very precipitately, till between 14 and 15 there are only 29,639 left in the whole country, on the male side of the picture, out of a total of 187,000. The female diagram chiefly differs from the other, from the increased extent of its 'undescribed regions,' to the sacrifice of the other two. There are also in the Census Report very elaborate tables, to show the nature of the employment to which children and young persons under 15 are subjected. This time of life is viewed under the three periods, into which the ages of 5 and 10 divide it. The labour of the first period does not appear valuable, and is not taken advantage of in any calling of life; there are, however, 114 reported as 'vagrants in barn, field, and tent.' The rest would seem to be dependent on relations or public bodies, and charities. Under the next era, from 5 to 10, more than 6,000 are classed as agricultural labourers, while cotton absorbs about 4,000, and wool in its different forms as many more. Lace and straw-plait require the labour of no less than 6,000 of these youthful toilers, and coal pits 1,220. The only other large item is 2,800, whose little feet are brought into action to run messages; domestic service also employs about 1,300. Under the last column, from 10 to 15, we come to much higher numbers: agriculture 110,000; cotton nearly 50,000; wool and silk as many; and coal mining 23,000.

Many other branches of industry also employ the labour of this age, in numbers proportioned to their own importance. With respect, however, to the younger of these children, thus classified as occupied in labour, it must be difficult to distinguish between such as are partially engaged in domestic service, manufactures, or field-work, whilst at the same time they attend school; and such as on the other hand are altogether absent from all means of education. In agriculture, especially, there are processes which occupy children in large numbers only for short intervals of the year; the school being open to them during the remainder. Are then the children thus classified distinct

from, or intermingled with, the other numbers, under the head of scholars? The period of the year at which the Census was taken, and the little difference in point of regularity of attendance between agricultural and other schools, as well as the necessity of making separate heads in the Census mount up to the proper total, would incline us to believe that these are distinct, and that the *occasional* labour of children is not reckoned. Still, however, whatever the attention, there must be considerable want of exactness in calculations that rest on so many ever-changing facts.

Some methodical system of half-time schools is a remedy to meet the present neglect of education, which seems forced on the attention of all concerned in this work. It appears to be a necessary part of our social habits, that the children of the poorest classes, both in agricultural and manufacturing classes, shall at the tender age of 10 be deprived of any further regular attendance at day-schools. If this be so, can no means be devised of practically meeting the case half-way? Evening-schools are in many places adopted with success, but, generally, we believe, they are more of adult schools, and are attended by persons above 15, who wish to make up for former neglect; and they are only carried on for a small portion of the year. Scarcely any information is given us about evening-schools for children; as Mr. Mann says that, 'compared with their importance, little has yet been done in this department.' From what information was obtained under the head of adult evening-schools, it appears that they are most numerous in the county of Lancashire and in the West Riding of Yorkshire, in the former of which 314 are reported, and in the latter 237. Chester has 78, Middlesex 76, and Norfolk 58, each having, on an average, about 20 scholars, rather more than two-thirds being of the male sex, chiefly agricultural labourers, artizans, or domestic servants. In the county of Suffolk, 100 fishermen are put down, which fact probably has some interesting story connected with it, if we could dive beneath the dry facts of a Census table. Of all the butcher-boys of England and Wales, it would seem that only 3 take advantage of this means of instruction; while, as if to contradict any assumption that the nature of their occupation brutalises the mind, the more innocent employment of milkmen only supplies a solitary devotee to nocturnal schooling.

It has been suggested, (and in some places attempted,) as another way of meeting the case, to have schools open from about ten o'clock till three, with only an interval of half-an-hour for dinner. This is chiefly for boys who clean shoes in the morning, and for girls who are similarly occupied in small domestic works, and who wish to get through their schooling at

one time. Some method of reconciling a certain amount of useful and remunerative labour with a certain amount also of instruction, seems to be, by common consent, a great want among the poorest classes. How to obtain this is the problem. Inasmuch as the design of it is a compromise between the schoolmaster and the employer, it of course follows that the cooperation of the latter must be obtained; which again implies that the interests of property must feel the responsibility of providing education to a greater extent than is at present the case. Mr. Bellairs' testimony on this subject is thus:—

'My own impression is, that the only way in which to meet this difficulty would be by adopting a half-time system, and by applying to towns in general, and to agricultural places, the regulations which operate in manufacturing districts. How such a plan could be arranged just now I do not exactly see; but, if it could, the objections here alluded to might probably be avoided, viz., unfair taxation of the poor and loss of production to the country.'—*Minutes*, p. 402.

Literary, scientific, and mechanics' institutions form one subject of the Census, under the head of Secondary Education. 1,057 of these are reported; but there is a peculiar tendency in such institutions to exaggerate their real facts; and, therefore, we place but little confidence in the steady usefulness of the operations which might seem to be implied in the returns. Literary institutions not under good management are found often to become receptacles of second-rate vulgar novels, *instructive* in their way, but hardly to be considered as part of education. The vaguest schemes are also, in some cases, reported as accomplished facts, especially under the head of mechanics' institutions. We know of a clergyman who was surprised to learn, for the first time, in this census return that the place of his residence possessed a mechanics' institution, with a library of 1,700 volumes, a numerous body of subscribers, and lectures on science and the arts. On making inquiry, which in a population no larger than the size of the alleged library was not difficult, he gathered that there was a *scheme* of the kind started in 1851, and that a certain closet, which was seldom opened, was supposed to contain a considerable number of Chambers' Journal, and a few other old periodicals. The idealists of 1851 were much surprised to find their long-forgotten schemes assume so bold a form in the census tables now published.

One important element of our present system of instruction still remains to be considered, about which the Census gives many particulars that are interesting, if really fulfilled in actual life. We refer to Sunday-schools, as wholly distinct from day-schools, both in management and in general design. Mr. Mann enters on this subject with a warmth and animation of style that betrays the consciousness of being, for some reason or other, in

atmosphere of facts and figures that coincide with some vourite ideas of his own, more than had been the case in the atistics of day-schools. The plans and tables which he had rawn out, to exhibit the *denominational* agencies of day-schools, id often too rudely dealt with the whole principle of the quality of religious sects, by containing large figures opposite ie words 'Church of England,' while the rest of the page was most a blank. On Sunday, however, it would appear that issenters rouse themselves, and assert a position, in compason with the Church, more approaching to the revelations of ligious worship. To illustrate this difference, we must remember that in day-schools supported by religious bodies, the hurch of England educates 924,474 out of a total of 1,188,786. t appears, however, that on Sunday the total number of holars are 2,369,039, while those belonging to the Church of ngland are only 935,892,—10,000 more than the number of ay-scholars. Against this sabbatical increase of only 10,000 n the part of the Church, the Dissenters show an increase in ieir schools of more than 1,000,000. The Independents, who nly muster 50,000 in the week, have 343,000 on the Sunday; ie Methodists have also about 50,000 in the week, but are ated to muster on the Sunday, through their several branches nd connexions, the immense number of 750,000. The Roman atholics, on the other hand, have only 33,000 on Sunday, hich is 10,000 less than the number of day-scholars. The ultitudes of those *taught* require a corresponding number of *achers*, who are said to amount to 318,135. These figures, Ir. Mann justly observes, will create a feeling of surprise; and s he is conscious that 'the opinions actually expressed by public writers of the value of the Sunday-school considerably vary,' he proceeds to explain, at some length, the nature and orking of these institutions. After stating that secular instruction is only imparted as the means of acquiring religious, nd, therefore, of furthering the special object of these schools, e continues:—

'In general, every local Sunday-school is the offshoot of an individual ongregation, from the midst of which the teachers are selected. It is anaged by a committee, having for its president the minister. Its officers re a secretary, treasurer, and superintendent, generally chosen annually y the teachers. The scholars, who, though mainly, are not exclusively omposed of the working class, are mostly upwards of six years of age; ut the tendency is now to establish infant classes for all between three nd six. The proportion of *adults* in Sunday-schools considerably varies n different districts of the country; Wales and the manufacturing counties aving very many upwards of 14 years, while London has but very few. Unfortunately, no inquiry was made at the census as to the *age* of Sunday cholars, so that we are still without complete intelligence on this important point. This difference of age in the scholars necessarily involves the

distribution of them into different classes, suited to their varying attainments: there is the *infant* class, as above referred to, for the children under six—the *ordinary* class for children between six and fourteen (divided into two or three sections, according to their ability to read)—and the *senior* class for young persons upwards of 14.'—*Census*, 1851, pp. lxxi. lxxii.

The course of instruction is thus described:—

'There are usually two school-attendances each Sunday, one in the morning, beginning about nine or half-past nine o'clock, and the other in the afternoon, commencing about two. On each occasion school is opened with devotional exercises, such as singing, reading of the Scriptures, and prayer. Next, the scholars who have committed tasks to memory repeat them. Then, the Bible lesson follows: portions of Scripture having been allotted to particular Sundays, scholars are expected to come prepared, by week-day study of the passage, for a catechetical examination by the teacher, who on his part ought to come prepared by similar study to impart the full meaning of the text, and to enforce its doctrines. . . . In the *senior* class the same plan is pursued as in the ordinary classes of children able to read; except that, of course, a superior ability of teaching is required. Indeed, an efficient instructor of a senior class has need, apparently, of information and capacity but little inferior to what is necessary for the regular ministry.'—*Ibid.* p. lxxii.

The age of a large proportion of Sunday-school scholars is, as might be supposed, very young.

'The number of scholars under six years of age has been computed at about 400,000. The total number of children, of all ranks, between three and six, in England and Wales, may be stated at 1,338,890; and of those between three and *seven* at 1,765,420. The proportion of these belonging to the working classes would be about 1,004,168 and 1,324,065 respectively.' —*Ibid.* p. lxxv.

The various modes of teaching these infants are described; as, for instance, with movable letters on box-lids, shown from a gallery. The great desideratum, however, of Sunday-schools is felt, he says, by all to be the senior class, through which the influence of an earlier age may be continued. Much good is attributed to the mixture of young persons of the middle classes with the children of the poor, in the capacity of their Sunday-school teachers. Sick-clubs, festivals, lectures, excursions, all are made to hang from the Sunday-school; and the spiritual culture of the young, as well as the harmony of various orders of the whole people, are said to be promoted by them as 'most necessary and effective instruments.' The perfection, however, of the senior class seems to be still future:—

'This is, indeed, made manifest by the returns of religious worship; for, unquestionably, most of the four or five millions who are constantly away from public worship must have passed through the Sunday school. It is, therefore, proposed to establish, in every school, a higher class for young persons upwards of 14, the course of instruction in which shall be of a more elaborate character than that of the general school. It is thought that, by throwing an air of dignity around the senior class, many may be attracted to attend it who would feel unwilling to be mingled with the children in the general school. But in proportion to the importance of these senior classes

directed to the schools, which I found deplorably conducted." '—*Minutes*, p. 758.

After mentioning some local circumstances, he proceeds:—

'The cause of the evil in this case I believe to be, that the last incumbent, the promoter of the building, thought the Sunday school—that pet object of rivalry in a Lancashire town—everything, and the daily school nothing, or next to nothing, in comparison. The very rooms in this case, with their fittings-up, were manifestly erected for the purposes of a Sunday school, and not of a week-day school.'—*Ibid.* p. 758.

The secret indignation of his mind is still further demonstrated in the somewhat rough handling of the following passage:—

'The money for building is voted out of the public funds expressly for the purpose of a daily school, and to that purpose it should be honestly applied. It is not right, under such circumstances, to be hearty and energetic in all that affects the Sunday school, and to be fully satisfied with letting the daily school drag on a nominal and useless existence. I protest against that unwise spirit of the age,—happily, I believe, on the decline,—which would sacrifice the more humble and unattractive, but not less important, work of the daily school, to the éclat which in many parts attends a large Sunday school, with its occasional speechifying, and its smart array of neatly-dressed scholars, and of young lady teachers. The daily school is the place in which the young must be taught to understand and trained to appreciate the teaching of the Sunday school. Moreover, no reasonable man can doubt, I think, but that the teaching and training of five days in a week may be made, with due pains, more valuable, even in a strictly religious point of view, than of any one day in a week.'—*Ibid.* p. 759.

On one point, however, both these gentlemen seem to meet; and this coincidence is the more to be remarked from the concurrent testimony of others, also in the same direction. One of the suggestions made by the Committee of Convocation, in their report read by the Bishop of London last July, was, that there should be services in our churches specially adapted for children. Let us see, in the first place, what Mr. Mann says on the subject of this supposed want. In the passage we are about to quote, the peculiar view of Sunday-schools, which is practically adopted by Dissenters, comes out most evidently to be Mr. Mann's own idea of these institutions. The Dissenting Sunday-school, especially in the afternoon, is not a collecting of children together for the purpose of taking them to public worship; it is not an accessory to the chapel, but a substitute. The passage is as follows:—

'It is, doubtless, much to be desired that more attention should be paid by the higher classes of the Church to the working of what now has every appearance of a permanent institution; for no expectation, probably, can be indulged that the natural instructors of their children in religious knowledge (viz. parents) will be ever generally able and disposed to undertake and prosecute this duty; and it seems to be quite clear that the ordinary services of church and chapel are entirely inappropriate and unproductive to the *juvenile* community.'—*Census*, 1851, p. lxxiv.

We say, that incidentally this passage throws light on all the enthusiasm of Mr. Mann, in praise of the elaborate organization which he describes. He, like the Dissenters, does not look on this system as a feeder to the Church or Chapel, but as a substitute for it. To a certain extent we accept the hint suggested. Let us, however, in the next place, hear what Mr. Kennedy says on the same topic. The passage is so full of clearly stated facts and sentiments, that we are unable to curtail it.

'Now there is an important impediment in the way of due religious instruction, and to the due appreciation of religious services by the scholars in your National schools, which I desire to notice on this occasion. It is, that the Sunday's services are rendered irksome, and are in some degree meaningless to them. The day-scholars are usually assembled between 9 and 10 A.M. in the school-room; then follows generally a certain amount of teaching, after which they are led to church. This is all right; but unfortunately our services are decidedly too long for children under any circumstances; and this undue length of the services is greatly aggravated by the fact, that the children are too often stationed in some part of the church which is neither adapted to comfort nor to hearing. To all this must be added the fact, that the sermons are never addressed or adapted to them, and are, in sober truth, wholly unintelligible and uninteresting to them. Thus the religious services of the Sunday, which ought to be profitable and delightful to the children, are perverted into an object of distaste, if not of aversion. It was confessed to me by a zealous and indefatigable Sunday-school teacher, that it was often a difficult matter to prevent the boys from running away on the road from school to church. Here is a real and serious evil. One mode of counteracting it which has occurred to me is, that in towns we should have special services on Sunday, if possible in special chapels, for our National school children. The length of the whole service should be adapted to them; and the matter of the discourse should be suited to their circumstances as children, as well as to their capacity. This would make our observances on the Lord's day a living reality to the youthful poor, instead of its being, as it is at present, something which I do not like to characterise.'—*Minutes*, p. 762.

It is to be observed, that the writer of this passage is introduced to the subject, not by anything connected with Sunday-schools, but by the feeling of some deficiency in the religious training of day-scholars under his inspection. The labours of the week require that a proper use of the Sunday shall be added to them, or the religious element of the whole wants its stimulus and completion. Can then no practical lesson be taken from all their concurrent testimony. We have brought certain formal witnesses to state their opinions that a great mistake is made, every Sunday, in the treatment of the children of the poor, by the Church of England. Besides, however, the testimony of Convocation, of Inspectors, and of Registrars, we appeal to the weekly experience of almost every Churchman. Some are *reminded* of the fact in one way, and some in another. Some *contemplate* the Sunday-school during its attendance at Church *with feelings* of compassion, and others with those of irritation.

In either case the facts are the same, and are too well-known to need repetition. The attention or devotion of Sunday-school children, are things hardly thought of; they are only to be kept as quiet as possible, thrust into a corner, made to sit through the prayers, because kneeling gives opportunity for talking, and superintended by persons, who, in the very discharge of their duties, are compelled to be examples of the total neglect of all proper and reverential behaviour in Church. Exceptions there are to these statements, but we feel confident of their general accuracy. Perhaps in some Churches they may not be thrust into a corner, where they can quietly *play* for two hours, provided they are not too noisy,—they may even be in the centre of the Church or in the chancel; but if this is the case, they form a perpetual interruption to the devotional quiet of the whole congregation, unless, indeed, they are very highly trained under a system that is able to maintain the youthful mind in a state of awe and reverence for a great length of time. Where this is effected, some better results may be experienced; but, even here, we doubt the ultimate good of what must be an unnatural tension. The feeling of reverence ought to be associated in children with what is pleasant, and kind and good, not with a slavish awe, or with any lasting prostration of animal spirits. And in estimating Sunday-schools, the peculiar trials to which their management exposes the youthful teachers are often forgotten. Without the most careful watching, to elevate 'a young lady or gentleman' of the age of fifteen or sixteen into the perilous office of a religious instructor —to get them to take a class and be saluted as teacher—is productive of the greatest danger. Among Dissenters the Sunday-school teachers are a recognised class in the community, and a very useful one for proselyting purposes: but it is a class of young people of especially disagreeable and dangerous habits, flippant and irreverent in tone, and whose habit of constant association leads to gossiping and rivalry in dress as well as to other dangerous habits.

The question then would seem to occur, and does occur to many: Are Sunday-schools, after all, good and useful institutions? Called on to answer this question, with reference to Mr. Mann's report of them, we feel this difficulty to start with, that we are invited to judge of the good or evil done by Dissent; —for these schools, as he developes them, are undoubtedly the offspring of Dissenting bodies, and inconsistent with the practical arrangements of the Church, as at present existing, and certainly with the work of training up children to be attendants at Church, or professing Churchmen. As far then as it is a question between Church and Dissent, we must let it alone, for we are wholly incompetent to decide whether it is best for the children of Dis-

senters to be at the schools or meeting-houses of their respective bodies; or even if we decided for the former, it would not be as impartial judges of the intrinsic merits of the latter. As regards then the Church, how are we to answer the still pending question of the usefulness of Sunday-schools? To say that because they do not fulfil their purpose of producing future Church-goers, we should be better without them, would be simply to turn the children adrift on the care of their parents, which we know would lead, in very many instances, to their entire estrangement from all religion. To condemn Sunday-schools wholesale, is to condemn one great means by which a large portion of the Christian community are alone able to fulfil that work of mercy, which consists in teaching the ignorant. It is so obvious a good work to collect together those persons who form Sunday-school teachers, and give them the opportunity of voluntarily instructing or reading with their poor neighbours' children, that if little good seems to spring from it in that particular way which we had anticipated, we must accuse some details in the management of it, and not the great work of charity itself. It is a most wholesome Christian duty for those who have been instructed themselves, to impart instruction to children whose parents are unable to do it; and Sunday is an unexceptional day for the exercise of this work of love; it is also the only day which the labours of the week leave available for this purpose, to the great mass of volunteer teachers. In these two facts, we have indisputable arguments for Sunday-schools, which nothing can controvert. It is also a powerful testimony to any existing agency for this object, that it is found, when efficiently carried out, to produce certain moral and social advantages, and a certain amount of good feeling between different classes, in the way described by Mr. Mann. The 'smart array of neatly dressed scholars and young lady teachers,' are, in their proper place, very agreeable exchanges for abject and neglected dirt. One duty, however, or one religious observance, must not be made to supplant another, but work in harmony with it. The Dissenting Sunday-school aims at supplanting the use of God's house as far as regards children; while those of the Church are made an addition to it, though we fear not adjusted with perfect harmony. Both school and Church seem to suffer by a sort of mutual injury; but what suffers more than all, is the cheerful day of rest, which the child ought to enjoy, and look forward to all the week, as the bright spot of time's dull passage. Cannot all these be made to harmonise? Perhaps the united force of all, each *adding* strength to the other, might produce as happy results as *those* described by Mr. Mann; results which would also last somewhat longer, and merge into the mature duties of a Chris-

tian life, as by a natural process of unchecked growth. In the first place, what is it that children require, in each of these three departments, in order to produce on their minds and souls a proper result? We should say that one unbroken hour's good religious instruction (for which preparation had been made in the week) would be sufficient, and as much as could be enforced with any advantage. If teachers really know what they have to do, and punctually attend to the work, they may easily get through a great deal of instruction or reading in this hour, and gain perhaps as favourable an influence over their pupils, as by fatiguing them, on their day of rest, for more than double that time. If it be replied that one hour will give no time for that kind of instruction which is meant to be a substitute for the day-school, we reply that a Sunday-school cannot, and ought not, to be one of common secular instruction, and that the attempt to make it such, is robbing God of His one day, because Mammon will not spare time out of his six.

If one hour would suffice for school, the same time would also be as much as could be required of their devotional powers within the sacred walls of the Church. This would be divided into morning and evening service, with perhaps another quarter of an hour, at one or other of these occasions, for a plain catechetical address, to be the fulfilment of our Church's intention where she orders, in the rubric, that the young people shall be catechised after the second lesson, and in the canons, before evening service. Two hours and a half is thus all that seems to be required from the whole of Sunday, which leaves ample scope for such recreation and pleasure as parents may be able to supply. If it be said, that one object of a Sunday-school is to keep children out of harm's way for as long a time on the Sunday as possible; and that the present arrangement is good, because it detains them, from about nine o'clock to half-past four, with only a short interval for dinner, under religious influence suitable to the character of the day; we reply at once that here another element is introduced into the question, which we wholly ignore, viz., that we have to enforce a puritanical severity on children in their observance of the day. If, under some peculiar circumstances, it is necessary to detain children from their homes as much as possible on that day, knowing that moral contamination there awaits them; in that case, let the managers of Sunday-schools recognise the fact, that in addition to the work of teachers, they are taking on themselves the duties of guardians for the time being, and, therefore, should treat them accordingly, and provide for the children, during the time that they keep them, over and above the usual hours of instruction or devotion.

nected body with all the feeling of the Church being their own for the time being. The whole principle, indeed, of special services, now we presume under consideration, must assume for its basis, the general idea of Churches being always open and available for various congregations, at different services and offices of religion going on throughout the whole day. Again the teachers of Church Sunday-schools ought to understand that the main object of their work is to bring up those, whom they instruct, in the habits of prayer and worship to God. Their work then is incomplete, if they leave the children after a certain amount only of *instruction*. They ought to take their own classes to Church, and be examples to them of devout and reverential conduct. Under the present system this is too much to expect of them, but if the attendance of children were of shorter duration, and were their comforts more considered, in having better places and more fit appliances of devotion allotted we cannot but think that teachers would easily fall into this system. The great objection now is, that they cannot listen to the sermon, if they sit with the schools; but if the children themselves were not present at the sermon, this at once falls to the ground.

In concluding this subject, we would express a hope, that any special services for schools will be open also to all other children and, indeed, to anyone who wished to enter the Church. We cannot but think that parents of all classes would avail themselves of these opportunities, of bringing their children to short and more appropriate services than at present exist; also, that old people and others, who feel their need of catechetical instruction, would attend, when such offices were going on.

We cannot bring these statistics and remarks on education to a close, without some few comments on the present source of such energy as at present exists, and the light which may thereby be thrown on the measures that seem necessary, if we anticipate that the cause will progress for the future. The Inspectors of Schools all lament the indifference of real monied interest to the cause of education, and the difficulty of supporting schools from any voluntary contributions, that do not press with most unequal weight on the clergy. It is well known that the clergy are not a rich class, and that the property of the Church is becoming every day more secularised by the purchase of livings, and yet the burden of schools is suffered in many places, almost wholly to fall on the parochial clergy.

There has been a great agitation lately on the subject of schools, and a stimulus has been given to the clergy, who in many cases, under the immediate pressure of the urgent requirement of a parish, have established schools, without re-

Having now allotted to each of the three Sunday occupations, viz.: instruction, devotion, and recreation, its due share; how best can we make these harmonise with each other in the arrangements of the day? A few months ago it would have seemed utopian, not to say unconstitutional and seditious, to make any suggestions, which would imply that Sunday-school children need not be kept in church for two hours and a half in a morning, and one hour and a half in the afternoon; but since the wise and considerate suggestion of the Committee of Convocation, that there should be short services for children, we see the way much more clear before us; and the Act of Uniformity, which before stood up like a tall ridge of snowy mountains to oppose any progress, at once assumes a less impenetrable, and a less ice-bound appearance.

The details of such arrangements must, of course, depend on local circumstances and the staff of clergy. If the service for children is a special one, it would probably take place at nine o'clock or a little after, and be followed by the hour's schooling. In other places, where extra services were not convenient, the school might assemble at such a time as would allow the hour's work before morning service, suffering the schools to leave church after the third collect under some orderly superintendence. In the afternoon we would almost dispense with teaching in the school, but, in preference, would have the clergy catechise the elder and better prepared classes in the church (in company with any other young persons who would come), interspersing with his questions such words of address, as might form a practical sermon, more serviceable for schools than the two pulpit discourses, which at present are thought to be attended with so little advantage to them. A regular service would, of course, be connected with this, according to such arrangements as might best suit other suggestions now before Convocation; and where the afternoon service was continued in the present manner, there being no special one for children, they would leave before the commencement of the sermon, having already been addressed themselves. Thus their school and church day would end, not we hope—if the Church services had been spirited, and made cheerful by Christian music, in which they themselves take an active part—with that sense of dulness, which now seems, by current testimony, to drive them away from Church, as soon as they are released from the obligations of school.

Children's services, of the kind we imagine the Committee of Convocation to refer to, would require the Church to be more at their disposal, than any continuance of the exclusive pew system would allow. They must have thoroughly good parts of the Church for their use, in order that they may form a con-

nected body with all the feeling of the Church being their own, for the time being. The whole principle, indeed, of special services, now we presume under consideration, must assume, for its basis, the general idea of Churches being always open and available for various congregations, at different services and offices of religion going on throughout the whole day. Again, the teachers of Church Sunday-schools ought to understand, that the main object of their work is to bring up those, whom they instruct, in the habits of prayer and worship to God. Their work then is incomplete, if they leave the children after a certain amount only of *instruction.* They ought to take their own classes to Church, and be examples to them of devout and reverential conduct. Under the present system this is too much to expect of them, but if the attendance of children were of shorter duration, and were their comforts more considered, in having better places and more fit appliances of devotion allotted, we cannot but think that teachers would easily fall into the system. The great objection now is, that they cannot listen to the sermon, if they sit with the schools; but if the children themselves were not present at the sermon, this at once falls to the ground.

In concluding this subject, we would express a hope, that any special services for schools will be open also to all other children, and, indeed, to anyone who wished to enter the Church. We cannot but think that parents of all classes would avail themselves of these opportunities, of bringing their children to short and more appropriate services than at present exist; also, that old people and others, who feel their need of catechetical instruction, would attend, when such offices were going on.

We cannot bring these statistics and remarks on education to a close, without some few comments on the present source of such energy as at present exists, and the light which may thereby be thrown on the measures that seem necessary, if we anticipate that the cause will progress for the future. The Inspectors of Schools all lament the indifference of real monied interest to the cause of education, and the difficulty of supporting schools from any voluntary contributions, that do not press with most unequal weight on the clergy. It is well known that the clergy are not a rich class, and that the property of the Church is becoming every day more secularised by the purchase of livings, and yet the burden of schools is suffered, in many places, almost wholly to fall on the parochial clergy.

There has been a great agitation lately on the subject of schools, and a stimulus has been given to the clergy, who, in many cases, under the immediate pressure of the urgent requirement of a parish, have established schools, without really

counting the cost of maintaining them in a state of efficiency. An unequal system of voluntary taxation such as this cannot, however, last, and is not a basis on which we can expect that the cause will flourish. Let us, however, on this subject, refer to Mr. Douglas Tinling's report:—

'The present expense of these schools, inefficient as many of them are, falls so heavily on the parochial clergy, that they are unable to venture more largely without some additional local sympathy, or some exterior aid. I have been told by the clergy that the school costs them annually a sum varying from 10*l.* to 25*l.*, and that as they do not feel justified in risking a larger annual expenditure, they are therefore obliged to continue a system of school instruction which they are fully aware is insufficient and unsatisfactory.

'In speaking of the sum of 10*l.* to 25*l.*, I am referring only to the smaller schools: in many instances the expense of the parish schools falls far more heavily on the clergy; e. g., one clergyman in his published statement shows, on a greatly reduced scale of expenditure, the deficiency of 123*l.* 13*s.* in his annual income for his parish schools, which deficiency, when exceeding this amount, he for seven years cheerfully provided for. These schools for the most part depend upon the local funds, which are inadequate, being drawn almost entirely from the clergy, with the addition of a few very small subscriptions, and for this reason inefficient teachers are allowed to hold their places, and the school-room remains unfit for the teaching and training of the children of the poor.'—*Minutes*, p. 562.

If education then is to progress, it seems to follow from these facts, that a stimulus is necessary to the owners of property, to make them supply the funds. It is most injurious to the services of the Church, as well as to the poor of a parish, that a clergyman should have continually pressing on him a heavy charge for the school. What he has to spare from his income, he would often wish to employ in some little church or parochial arrangements, which his own special interest in the parish may suggest; or in direct relief to the poor, according to his own irresponsible choice of objects.

It is, indeed, a question whether, as a matter of pecuniary justice and right, property should not, in some form or other, be made to provide education for the poor. Wages, in agricultural districts, are calculated without any reference to the expense of education, and all agree that parochial schools cannot be self-supporting. If, therefore, the property of a parish is not forced, by local taxation, or its contribution to the consolidated fund, to provide schools, we fear that they will not exist. Education is a national requirement, and, therefore, he who neglects to educate his child is injurious to the community, as he is who will not vaccinate his child. Surely then means ought to be provided by which he can fulfil this obligation? e expense of vaccination is borne by local rates, and we do see, so far as the ground we have mentioned is concerned,

ools, for those children who naturally fall on public
r anything beyond food and clothing, should not be
supported by compulsory taxation. But, in deciding
uestion as this, other considerations must be taken into
besides that of pecuniary justice. The known ten-
State authority, local or central, to claim its *quid pro*
s pecuniary support, and control the use of the means
supplies, suggests great danger to the Church from
arrangement.

NOTICES.

ARCHDEACON CHURTON has bestowed great pains and care on another metrical translation of the Psalms. It is published, in commemoration of the excellent writer's Archdeaconry, under the title of 'The Cleveland Psalter,' (J. H. Parker.) Exhibiting great research, and a conscientious comparison of versions and commentaries, as well as a considerable command of poetical diction, if we say that the writer has succeeded as well as most, or even all, of his predecessors, we shall not, in our own estimation, award a very high praise. We believe that in this volume many of the Psalms are metricized as well as they can be: but after all we conclude, as in Mr. Keble's well-known judgment, that the thing is simply impossible. The genius of Eastern poetry is totally irreconcilable with the Western forms; and while we are free to admit, that graceful and useful poetical and religious exercises may be produced under the form of a metrical Psalter, they do not in any sense reproduce the Book of Psalms. For example: Archdeacon Churton has sought the widest variety in his metres. Does the Hebrew poetry contain in its various forms—for we are free to admit that it has syllabic varieties in length of the lines—anything equivalent to the palpable changes from the iambic to the dactylic and trochaic metres which we find in the present Version, as in many of its predecessors? However, we will let the 'Cleveland Psalter' commend itself, as, indeed, it deserves to do, to such of our readers, and we believe they are many, who do not share in our own dislike to all metrical Psalms. Here is the beginning of Psalm cxix.—one in our judgment eminently unsuitable to the four-line stanza; inasmuch as this particular Psalm is condensed, gnomic and terse in form, therein resembling the Proverbs. Whether its close moral tension and sharply-cut utterances are not, from the nature of the case, diluted and slackened in any stanza, we leave to the judgment of critics:—

'Ps. cxix.

'There is a way, where blessing meets
The pilgrim journeying on:
The saint, whose life was undefil'd,
In that blest way had gone.

'There is a law, whose rules of truth
The wand'ring soul reclaim;
And blest are they, whose heart adores
The God from Whom it came.

'No love misplac'd beguiles their souls
With fraud and wrong to stray:
They walk with innocence secure
In His all-perfect way.'

We do not say that the following, whose form is suggested by 'a familiar Children's hymn, Ere I sleep,' is not a graceful poem: but is it anything like David's Psalm!

'Ps. cxxxi.

'1. Lord, my heart is with the lowly;
I do seek,
With the meek,
Humble thoughts and holy.

'Let me not by vain aspiring
Strive to rise,
But be wise,
Safer truth desiring.'

'2. Pride that soars must fall in sadness;
Lowliness
God doth bless
With an infant's gladness;

'When it lies all weak from weaning,
Yet at rest
On the breast
In its gladness leaning.

'3. Nought my mind from God shall sever:
Israel, thou
Pay this vow
To thy King for ever.'

We submit the 'Cleveland Psalter' to a crucial experiment, in selecting from it two Psalms, on which, and very properly, Archdeacon Churton has bestowed all his skill.

'Ps. xxiii.

'1. My shepherd is the gracious Lord,
Amidst His flock I feed:
While I am His, and He is mine,
I cannot suffer need.

'2. He leads me, when on Judah's hills
The pastures spring and blow,
And welling from the eternal fount
Glad streams of comfort flow.

'3. He gives my troubled spirit rest,
Restor'd from sin and shame,
To paths of righteousness and peace,
For His most holy Name.

'4. Yea, though I walk in dreary vale
Of death's o'ercovering shade,
No evil will I fear, whilst Thou
Art near to bring me aid:

'Thy rod and staff sustain my soul
To tread the dangerous way;
Thy rod, in love to chasten me,
Thy staff, to be my stay.

'5. Before the foes who will my harm
My table Thou hast spread,
With wine hast crown'd my cup, and pour'd
Sweet odours on my head.

'6. Thy mercy and Thy goodness, Lord,
My help through life shall be,
Till in Thy house I find a home
For evermore with Thee.'

While some verses are close translation, verse 4 of the above psalm is plainly mere paraphrase and comment.

'Ps. c.

'1. Let all the peopled earth
To God their voices raise;
All tribes of mortal birth,
With gladness tell his praise;
To Him alone
Your offerings bring,
Rejoice and sing
Before His throne.

'2. O turn, your God to own,
The Lord, by Whom ye live;
Not man, but God alone
The gift of life could give:
Beneath His care
We feel no need,
Like flocks we feed
In pastures fair.

'3. O hasten to His gates,
Where saints with praises meet;
The courts, where blessing waits
The living Lord to greet:
Your thanks proclaim,
And tell aloud,
How good is God,
How great His name!

'4. For O, the Lord is good;
His mercy, as of yore,
Ere Ocean heav'd its flood,
Stands firm for evermore:
His truth shall reign
With lasting peace,
When time shall cease
To wax and wane.'

Mr. Gibson, of Furneux Pelham, has printed, under the title of 'Testimony of the Church to Holy Baptism,' (Bell,) a very complete catena of authorities, patristic, ritual, and reformed, on the subject. The passages we observe are translated, and the work is creditable both to the scholarship and churchmanship of the writer. It brings together, into an available compass, what has hitherto been found in detached and often inaccessible quarters.

'Hungarian Sketches' is the first instalment of a series, to be called 'Constable's Miscellany of Foreign Literature.' The general plan promises well: it offers a set of translations, chiefly, as we imagine, of popular and contemporaneous works, in which fiction will predominate. The first volume, some novelets by Moritz Jökai, introduces us to a new class of manners and character. In the latter respect, the writer is far inferior to Miss Bremer; but in mere power of external description, he somewhat resembles her. Hungarian country life, with its rough, rude, barbarous plenty, is a curious thing; and the uncommon quantity which the heroes eat and drink, causes us perpetual astonishment in reading this volume. It is absolutely cloying and surfeiting in the kitchen and cellar department. We have observed this peculiarity in inferior artists; a novel writer and a painter, when he can do nothing else, attracts universal attention, or perhaps sympathy, when his page, or his canvass, displays something to eat. Mr. Jökai is never so happy as when he has got all his dramatic company fairly at the dinner-table.

In his 'History of Scotland,' (Masters,) Mr. Flower has printed a useful little book, and one which carries on a favourite series, the 'Juvenile Englishman's Library.' Why thrice, at p. 231, Lord Balmerino is miscalled Bolderino we cannot conjecture.

We are very much afraid that Mr. Spry, of West Bromwich, hardly reaches that class of poets which neither gods, nor men, nor columns can endure. This gentleman, with the best possible intentions, prints certain words divided into decasyllabic masses, which the kind-hearted may take for blank verse—very blank verse indeed. Mr. Spry's subject is 'The Deluge,' (Birmingham: Langbridge.) Here is a specimen:—

> Yet seven days, an awful interval
> By God's forbearance, for repentance given,
> Ere his just work of punishment begins.
> His mercy men despised, his power defied,
> And God, in anger, bared his holy arm,
> To vindicate his justice and his truth,
> And sweep them like the chaff from off the earth.

Mr. Anderdon, in mentioning whose name we are betraying no confidence, has published in a handsome form a second edition of his delightful 'Life of Bishop Ken,' (Murray,) of which we have long since spoken our sincere admiration.

'The Plain Commentary,' (J. H. Parker,) that most practical series of all practical Bible notes, has proceeded to two more parts, embracing St. Luke. A greater encomium we cannot pass than to say that it equals its predecessors.

Archbishop Whately, in his recent Charge, 'Thoughts on Christian Moral-Instruction,' (J. W. Parker,) speaking of some of our comments on the disquisitions of himself and his friend, Bishop Copleston, says, 'that the Reviewer,'—meaning ourselves,—'probably was writing for such as he 'trusted had never read, nor were likely to read, any of the works in which 'these warnings had been put forth,' viz. Archbishop Whately's own works. Now, we must say this is very unfair in the Archbishop; he returns evil for good. Far from trusting that our readers will not read Archbishop Whately, we have generally been at the trouble of advertising all his works for nothing. We have always made a point of counting up the number of times Archbishop Whately quotes himself. And, save Archbishop Whately himself, we know nobody who has called such attention to Archbishop Whately's writings as ourselves. Certainly, we cannot say whether our readers are likely to read these works or not: but it is undeniable that we have taken explicit pains to proclaim their existence. Here they are once more, in the order in which they are known and quoted, bristling in look, polemic in sound, angry and defiant in gesture: the labours, as Archbishop Whately tells us, 'of a quarter of a century, earnestly and repeatedly setting forth a truth.' Only it is always in the shape of Whately's 'Peculiarities,' 'Difficulties,' 'Dangers,' 'Errors,' 'Abuses,' and 'Doubts'— which is not a little characteristic.

There is a simplicity and kindliness in Archdeacon Berens' 'Sermons for a Sick Room,' (Rivingtons,) which makes them a superior specimen of the good old-fashioned school of divinity. We always welcome the writings of this good man.

'Scenery, Science, and Art,' is a miscellaneous volume, by Professor Ansted, the geologist. It is published by Van Voorst, and is unequal in execution: it has a fragmentary and unconnected aspect. Nor are we quite satisfied with the mixture of criticisms on the picturesque and scientific details. On art, Mr. Ansted is common-place: science, and especially geology, is his strongest point.

Mr. Daniel Butler, of St. John's Wood, has preached and printed a 'Funeral Sermon,' for his colleague, Mr. Wharton, (J. W. Parker,) which is not only a graceful composition, but exhibits great skill and judgment in the writer. It commemorates just a respectable common-place character: and to do this, and to say everything that ought to be said, without fulsomeness or exaggeration, is no easy task. Mr. Butler has achieved it.

The theological book of the quarter—and it is that least prolific in new publications—is a volume of 'Academical Discourses,'—the Irish Bampton Lecture—on the Inspiration of Holy Scripture, by Mr. W. Lee, Fellow of Trinity College, (Rivingtons.) Mr. Lee pursues the subject beyond the ordinary details; and with reference 'to the *nature* of Inspiration itself, and 'to the possibility of reconciling the unquestionable stamp of humanity 'impressed upon every page of the Bible, with that undeviating belief in its 'lawfulness and infallibility, which is the Christian's most precious inheritance,' he endeavours to supply a blank in English theology. With the same object, he distinguishes between Revelation and Inspiration; and especially combats the views of S. T. Coleridge and Mr. Morell.

Few laymen have worked more steadily and more practically than Mr. Henry Hoare, in the cause of the restoration of Synodal action. He has, therefore, especial claims to be heard, in detailing the progress of the cause. We have before us a 'Report of the Proceedings at a Meeting at Chichester,' (Rivingtons,) in which Mr. Hoare took part; and though we are disposed to think that he not unnaturally perhaps attributes more of the success of the cause to his own immediate friends than to other workers, it is quite certain that he does not say enough of his own personal exertions and sacrifices.

Mr. Strachey, in his 'Miracles and Science,' (Longmans,) has got out of his depth.

The Rev. Nash Stapleton publishes 'Three Broad Sheets analytical of the Church Catechism,' (Groombridge:) this analysis proves that Mr. Stapleton himself is in serious need of instruction in the document which he undertakes to explain.

We welcome in the seventh volume of 'The Monthly Packet,' (Mozley,) the most complete, and varied, and lively periodical of a serious cast which reaches us.

'The Violet's Close; or, Annie Dale,' (Hatchards,) contains some truths; *ex. grat.* p. 56: 'It is wonderful to think of time, and how it passes. 'To reflect that each minute as it glides has gone for ever! That all the 'wealth which every land could produce, could not bring a single second 'back!'

A letter, which certainly requires an answer, has been written to Mr. Dale, of S. Pancras, by one of the district incumbents, Mr. Millner, of Kentish Town, (Darling.) Its title is, 'Parochial Division, the only remedy for the Spiritual Wants of St. Pancras.' Its substance is a tolerably explicit charge that the Vicar's scheme of dividing the parish is to get rid of all the work, and to retain all the pay.

'Readings for the Aged,' (Masters,) is the second part of an ingenious and useful attempt on the part of Mr. Neale to found some sort of instruction to a small congregation of old and sick people under his care, on the minor Church festivals. They exhibit all the writer's rare facility of illustration and language, clear, popular, and not vulgar.

We cannot testify our delight with the 'Narrative of the Bishop of Newfoundland's Second Voyage to Labrador,' performed last year, so practically as by giving a specimen of it:—

'*Friday, August 12th.*—We removed to-day to Ward's Harbour, (thirty-'five miles,) with a very light breeze, sailing at five o'clock, and coming 'again to anchor at three o'clock in the afternoon.

'Mr. Kingwell followed in his boat, (this place, with all the Bay to the 'north of Twillingate being in his Mission,) but could not leave before ten 'o'clock, and was twelve hours making the journey.

'Mr. Boone went on shore, and found the principal planter, through 'whose exertions chiefly the little church (a very humble but neatly 'finished structure) was built, prepared to receive and welcome us. He showed his church with modest satisfaction, which, though only a wooden

'room, twenty-four feet by eighteen, with five square windows, has cost 'him some seventy pounds, besides labour; as great a sacrifice or expen- 'diture perhaps for him, as the whole cost of a cathedral would be to some '"that have riches." He was very desirous to have the building conse- 'crated, and with it the land adjacent, which he and his neighbours had 'marked out for a grave-yard. I felt little or no difficulty about the church, 'but could not consent to consecrate the grave-yard while it had no fence. 'He met that difficulty by engaging to put up a temporary fence of stakes 'and nets to-morrow, and a more substantial one of rails and piekets before 'the winter. Feeling sure that his promise, God willing, would be per- 'formed, I did not hesitate to grant all his request. He spoke to me with 'much deep and right feeling of a neighbour who had been his chief asso- 'ciate and assistant in planning and building their church, and whom, after 'watching over and tending in a long illness, as the physician of both body 'and soul, he had lately consigned to his last resting-place, in the grave-yard 'of their own choice. "He had been wild," he said, "in his younger days, 'but for three years he had been an altered character, and before his death 'he told me all he had done wrong." The poor man, it seems, had recog- 'nised the duty, if not the privilege, of the Apostle's injunction, "Confess 'your faults one to another;" and that other duty and privilege had not 'been forgotten by his friend, "to pray one for another." We walked 'together to some of the lovely harbours or "Arms," as they are called, 'and I was pleased to observe several large patches of land under cultiva- 'tion, with promising crops of potatoes, &c. I derived much gratification, 'and I hope some instruction, from my walk.

'*Saturday, August* 13*th.*—While Mr. Kingwell was employed preparing 'his candidates for Confirmation, and Mr. Freer in measuring and laying 'down the church, grave-yard, and small portion of land for a glebe, I 'journeyed with Mr. Boone in a boat to a neighbouring settlement, called 'Nimrod Tickle (nine miles). We left at half-past eight, and did not reach 'our destination till two o'clock. We visited all the families, six or seven, 'all happily members of the Church, and remarkably clean and tidy in 'their dwellings, &c. Our stay was unfortunately very short, and it was 'well we did not remain longer, as we were four hours in returning. We, 'however, arrived in time to visit the church and grave-yard, and inspect 'the preparations made for to-morrow's holy services. We found the fence 'of nets and stakes duly set up. My lectern was carried into the church, 'to supply both reading-desk and pulpit. A better table also had been 'placed at the east end, and a stand erected for the "font-basin," that at 'least, in outward things, the Apostle's injunction might be observed, and 'all things be done decently and in order.

'12*th Sunday after Trinity, August* 14*th.*—The little wooden building was 'duly consecrated and dedicated to the honour of God, and his worship 'and service only, by the name of Christ's Church—and, I trust and 'believe, with all due devotion and readiness of mind, if not with all the 'formality and circumstance of such services, in more favoured or more 'wealthy localities. A Missionary Bishop, with two Priests and a Deacon, 'and a few simple-minded and devout fishermen, were perhaps as suitable 'in setting apart this simple wooden structure, in a remote harbour of 'Newfoundland, as the more splendid processions of our native country, to

'testify their zeal of God's House, and of His holy name. The administration of the Lord's Supper followed, as I suppose it always does if possible, the consecration of the house, if it does not rather form a part of the service. I was thankful to observe the worthy promoter of the church, with all the members of his family who had attained to a proper age (six or seven in number), devoutly attending and partaking together of this heavenly feast.

'In the afternoon the same parties were all confirmed, as I make no scruple of admitting those persons to the Holy Communion in the morning, who are about to be confirmed in the afternoon, according to the permission of the Rubric, in reference to those who "are ready and desirous to be confirmed." Grandparents and parents with their children took upon themselves, (I hope and believe devoutly and intelligently,) and in the presence of the congregation, those vows and promises which they knew to have been binding upon them, and by which they had been bound in their hearts and lives long before. Two children were baptized after the second Lesson; and at the conclusion of the service and sermon, the petition for the Consecration having been read in the church, the grave-yard was consecrated, the people walking the bounds, and repeating the Psalms with myself and the other Clergy. The day was warm and bright, and the air clear and calm, and Ward's Harbour was blessed in a Sabbath with God's richest mercies of nature and grace. I invited the worthy planter, with all his family and connexions in the neighbourhood, on board the Church Ship in the evening, to practise Psalmody, in which they take much delight, and are very desirous to improve; and they thankfully availed themselves, men and women, of the opportunity; and I entirely believe we complied with the Apostolic precept, both speaking to ourselves and to each other in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs, and singing and making melody in our hearts to the Lord.

'They all agreed it was "the beautifullest house" and "beautifullest church" they had ever seen.

'*Monday, August 15th.*—We were favoured with a fair but light wind, and reached Nipper's Harbour before twelve o'clock. The title or name is rather an alarming one, particularly to thin-skinned Southerners, as the Nipper is the largest and most formidable of the mosquitoes; and it might be supposed that the Harbour obtained its affix, or distinguishing title, from the number of these tormentors. Probably, in former times, the Harbour was full of wood; but as the wood has diminished till almost none remains, (as is unhappily the case in nearly every inhabited Harbour,) the flies have become less numerous and troublesome; and they are everywhere fewer than usual this summer. The shore or outward face of the rocks, on this side of the Bay, is most barren and forbidding—not less so than Labrador; but concealed behind or within this iron-work are beautiful coves and bights, well wooded, and with abundance of wild grass and other vegetation, and, where there are inhabitants, potatoes and other garden produce. Mr. Kingwell, who followed us in his boat, arrived soon enough to accompany Mr. Boone, and to visit the people on shore, and invite them to our Evening Service on board. There are several planters here of apparently considerable opulence and respec-

'tability, living in decent houses, and with many comforts. One of the 'principals is an Englishman, but resident here thirty-three years. His com- 'forts may be in some degree due to four noble-looking sons, the youngest 'nineteen, all unmarried, and living and working at home. At the Even- 'ing Service, all these four were confirmed on board, with a few others. 'There were several more candidates, but they were deficient in know- 'ledge, and Mr. Kingwell had not been able to give them the neces- 'sary instructions. Those presented, were selected as well prepared and 'seriously disposed. Our cabin was filled with a most respectable and 'attentive congregation. I exhorted them, among other things, to proceed 'with their Church, which, though but a wooden structure like the rest, 'has been many years in progress, or rather not in progress, but standing 'still, and not so much for want either of ability or desire on the part of 'the people to finish it, as for want of some person to direct and order 'them. Could the Missionary remain but a fortnight in the place, to 'assign their parts and overlook and encourage them, he might see the 'good work completed, without his labour or other assistance, by the 'people themselves.

'It is obvious, however, that by a knowledge of joiner's and carpenter's 'work, he might materially assist as well as encourage; and I think 'it of importance that instruction in such matters should be given, 'in due place and proportion, at St. Augustine's and other Missionary 'Colleges. It is of far more importance, however, even in these works 'purely mechanical, that Clergymen should know how to direct and employ 'the mind and will of the people. The presiding mind is more necessary 'than the helping hand; and there is, of course, some danger of a Clergy- 'man losing his proper place and influence, in descending to manual 'labour and cooperation.

'In this Harbour, however, twenty stout and handy men would, I be- 'lieve, be found, needing no help or direction beyond exhortation and 'admonition; and a decent church might be completed in a fortnight. 'I was truly grieved that my stay must necessarily be so short; and I did 'what lay in my power to know and be known by the principal people, by 'receiving and conversing with them in my own cabin after the service.

All our readers will welcome a new series of 'Synodalia,' chiefly confined to documents, under the title of 'The Journal of Convocation,' (Rivingtons,) and the tried and valued editorship of Mr. Warren. How suggestive is the title!

A flight of Visitation and Commemoration Sermons, 'thick as autumnal leaves,' has reached us. Among them we may specify, 1. Mr. Lowe's, of Hurstperpoint, 'The Lord and Giver of Life,' (Masters.)—2. 'Ministerial Watchfulness,' by Mr. Cochin, of Birmingham, (Hatchard.)—3. 'The Presence of Christ in Holy Places, by Mr. Courtenay, (Masters.)—4. Mr. H. Seymour's, on 'Good Works at Bishop of Worcester's Visitation,' (Rivingtons.)—5. Mr. Cunningham's 'Ordination Sermon,' at Farnham ~stle, (Hatchards.)—6. 'The Wisdom of Bezaleel,' by Mr. Baines, (Skef- ɔn.)

INDEX TO VOL. XXVIII.

(NEW SERIES.)

ARTICLES AND SUBJECTS.

B.

Bunsen, Philosophy of Language, 448—460. Etruscan language, 448. Are the Etruscans an indigenous race? 449. Müller, Betham, 450. Mrs. H. Gray, 451. Bunsen, 452, 453. Leibnitz, 454. Humboldt, 455. Bunsen on Etruscan language, 456. A mixed language, 459.

C.

Census, &c. [*Census of Great Britain*, 1851. *Education*, &c. &c.] 461—501. Interest of the subject, 461. Results, 462. History of popular education, Raikes, Lancaster, Bell, National Society, &c. 463—465. Proportion of scholars to children, 466, 467. Quality of instruction, 468. Remuneration, 469. Training colleges, 470. Deficiency of education, 471. Centralization, 474. Grammar schools, 475—478. Church Education, 479—485. Employment of children, 486. Half-time schools, 488. Literary Institutions, 489. Sunday-schools, 490—501.

Convocation Literature [*Works by Fraser, Wake, Atterbury*, &c.] 369—400. Present aspect of the Convocation question, its reform, 370. Old writers on Convocation, 371. Reign of William III., 372. The Non-Jurors, 373. Sir Bartholomew Shower, 375. Wake, 376. Hill, 378. Atterbury, 379, 380. White Kennet, 381. Hody, 383; and the subsequent controversy, 384—400.

E.

Etruria, Cities and Cemeteries of [*Dennis's Etruria, &c.*] *79—109.* Interest of Tuscany, 79. Recent writers, Mrs. H. Gray, Mr. Dennis, 80. Present state of the country,—Veii, 82. Vetulonia, 83. Sovana, 85. Tomb of Porsena, 87. Etruria and Rome, 89. Etrurian creed, polity, and history, 89—103. Egypt, 104. Etruscan works of art, 106, 107. Etrurian influences, 108, 109.

I.

India, the Church in [*Evidence before the House of Commons*, &c.], 45—78. Select Committee of 1852, 45. The Church in India, 46. Its origin, 47. The Church is for the Company's servants, 48. The Chaplains, 49. Relations with the Bishop, 50. The Church Erastian, 51, and Governmental, 52. The English Missions, 53—58. Evidence before the House of Commons, 58. The *status* of the Bishop, 59—63. St. Paul's cathedral, Calcutta, 64. Portuguese clergy, 65. State and prospects of the Indian Church, 66—78.

J.

Jews [*The Kings of the East*, &c.], 110—170. The future of the Jewish people, 110. Their conversion, 111, and probable restoration, 112, illustrated by Scripture, 113, 114. Their temporal prospects. 115—120. The opinions of the Fathers, 122—127; of great doctors, 128—134; of a tone of Christian and Jewish feeling at various times, 135—150. Opinions of distinguished authors, 151—170.

Christianity? 277. Denied by Dr. Milman, 280—282. Sketch of his history, 283. Damasus, 284—287. The first four centuries, 288—290. The next sixty years, 290—294; down to Gregory I., 294—300. Mohammedanism, &c., 301—308. From A.D. 800 to A.D. 1044, 308—316. Paschal II., 316—318. History of Christianity, 319. Its lessons and offences, 320—326.

S.

Societies, Religious [*Clarke's Memoirs of the Wesleys*, &c.], 195—219. Samuel Wesley the Elder, 195. Religious Societies of his day, 196—201. Religious Conferences, 202—206. Stephens, 206. John Wesley, 208. Necessities of the age, 209. How far these Religious Societies are capable of a revival, 210—219.

Sherwood, Mrs. [*Life of Mrs. Sherwood*, &c.], 327—368. Biography, 327. Mrs. Sherwood, 328. Her childhood, 329. Parentage, 330—334. Sent to school, 334. Her religion, 335—337. She leaves school, 338. Her home life, 339—341. Her marriage, 342, 343. She sails for India, 344. Her life, 345—364. The closing scene, 365. General reflections, 366—368.

V.

Voltaire [*Bungener's Voltaire and his Times*], 171—194. French infidelity fashionable, 171. Voltaire its centre, 172. His history and life, 173—194.

ICES OF BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

rchitecture —
ı and others—
ı Religion —
ıurch—Bishop
Trench's Syn-
al Lectures—
he Old Testa-
—Vestiges of
Mots par un
Aquarium—
Susanna, and
ck Oak—Cas-
ed—Songs for
:s of Oxford
—Consecration
ıe Conversion
Whately's Re-
A Month in
ıghes—Hospi-
ıs by Messrs.
ller, Sowter,
c.

OCTOBER. — Churton's Cleveland Psalter — Testimony of the Church to Holy Baptism—Hungarian Sketches — Juvenile Englishman's Library — The Deluge — Anderdon's Life of Bishop Ken—The Plain Commentary—Archbishop Whately's Charge — Berens' Sermons for a Sick Room—Scenery, Science, and Art—Funeral Sermon by Mr. Butler — Lee's Irish Bampton Lecture — Proceedings of a Meeting at Chichester — Miracles and Science — Stapleton's Three Broad Sheets—The Monthly Packet—The Violet's Close—Millner's Letter to Dale—Readings for the Aged—Bishop of Newfoundland's Second Voyage to Labrador—The Journal of Convocation — Sermons by Messrs. Lowe, Cochin, Courtenay, Seymour, Cunningham, and Baines.

LAY, PRINTER, BREAD STREET HILL.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
OF MICH.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

DATE DUE

JUN 22 1983

JUL 5 1983

JUN 16 1983

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
3 9015 06224 5736
MICH.
1906

DO NOT REMOVE
OR
MUTILATE C